SOCIETY AT THE TIME OF THE BUDDHA

NARENDRA WAGLE

SHOUT
SHARE
IT

SOCIETY AT THE TIME OF THE BUDDHA

Narendra Wagle

PALI LITERATURE has provided mass of data on the life and culture of ancient India. Modern historical research has, however, shown that this literature was composed during different periods and therefore reflects varying social conditions. Theravada Pali Cannon especially **Sutta** and **Vinaya Pitakas** formulated in the centuries immediately succeeding Buddha is the main source for a reliable account of the social conditions of the age intimately connected with the personality of Gautama the Buddha.

In this pioneering study, in its second revised edition, the author has defined the contours of social, economic and religious structures. He has examined the units of patterns of settlement such as village-town-city and region, analysed in the context of people and groups which inhabited those units. Through an exhaustive analyses of the terms of address and reference, he has established the social ranking and social groups.

The gods in relation to human society studied in the book reveals a complex pattern of interactive relationships. It shows how the gods and their worlds are conceived by various social and religious groups. The use of money and other economic activities which provide its material basis are reviewed. The Buddha provided ideological base for people generating wealth in society.

As Prof. A.L. Basham in his Foreword to the 1st edition points out, "Dr. Wagle has shown originality of approach in examining the structure of the society. He has utilised the technique of criticism both of a historian and of a social scientist. He has produced many valuable conclusions which may compel us to revise, in many respects, our existing picture of the period."

ISBN 81-7154-553-X

9116

SOCIETY AT THE TIME OF THE BUDDHA

NARENDRA WAGLE

POPULAR PRAKASHAN
BOMBAY

POPULAR PRAKASHAN PVT. LIMITED
35-C, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya Marg
Opp."Roche", Tardeo, Bombay-400 034

©1995 by Narendra Wagle

First Published 1966
Second revised edition, 1995

(3366)

ISBN 81-7154-553-X

PRINTED IN INDIA

by Gopson Papers Pvt.Ltd., A-28, Sector IX, Noida and
published by Ramdas Bhatkal for Popular Prakashan Pvt. Ltd.,
35-C,Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya Marg, Bombay 400 034

for my parents

Foreword

MUCH has been written already about the historical content of the Pāli scripture. Ever since this great body of ancient Indian literature was brought to light by pioneers such as Turnour, it has aroused great interest among scholars, not only for the profound religious message which it contains, but also for the light it throws upon a vigorous and expanding civilization. The Pāli canon reflects Northern India in the fifth century B.C. more vividly than does almost any other body of sources for any later period of her pre-Muslim history.

Great scholars, working mainly before the First World War, especially Rhys Davids and Fick, have analysed the immense mass of data which these sources provide. We cannot but admire the scholarship and patient labour which they put into their work. But it must be admitted that their handling of this material by the standards of modern historical criticism shows many shortcomings. One of the most outstanding of these is that both these great scholars and many others who succeeded them accepted the whole of the canon and also the commentarial literature ascribed to Buddhaghosa together with the prose *Jātaka* as all of equal validity, all faithfully reflecting the culture of the Buddha's day.

Stylistic criteria and striking difference in such cultural features as their respective geographical backgrounds show clearly that the *Vinaya Pitaka* and the first four *Nikāyas* of the *Sutta Piṭaka* are considerably older than the prose *Jātaka*, and the civilization which they reflect is appreciably different from that reflected in the commentaries. For a reliable account of social conditions in the Buddha's day, therefore, the *Jātakas* and the commentaries must be rejected out of hand. The study of Dr. N.K. Wagle is to the best of my knowledge the first effort at analysing the social structure of the period on the basis of those sources which were composed not long after the period in question. In this Dr.Wagle has shown great

originality of approach.

Even more original is Dr.Wagle's method of treatment of his material. He has brought to bear upon his sources not only those techniques of criticism which are well known to historians, but also those of the science of anthropology. He has subjected his data to minute analysis along those lines and produced many valuable conclusions which may compel us to revise in many respects our existing picture of the period.

Work such as Dr.Wagle's is tedious and slow, and he has so far only treated one or two themes in the social history of the period. There is scope for much further research on the contents of the older stratum of Pāli literature. When this is exhausted the *Jātakaṣ* and the Pāli commentaries still remain virtually untapped, and the Epics, the *Purāṇas* and the great body of Jain literature may also provide material for further research along these lines. This very important pioneering work of Dr.Wagle's, I hope, be followed by many others of a similar type, both from Dr.Wagle himself and from other young Indian scholars who may find his treatment inspiring and stimulating.

London, 1963 *A.L. Basham*

Preface

THIS is a revised edition of *Society at the Time of the Buddha*, first published in 1966. I have eliminated the 110 pages appendix to Chapter III from the earlier edition. Chapter IV is new. I have incorporated additional material in Chapter VI. I have retained Professor A.L. Basham's foreword to the 1966 edition. Professor Basham died in 1986, and the world lost a great British historian of Ancient India.

Toronto, 1995 *N.K.W.*

Contents

Foreword

Preface

Chapter I *Introduction* *1*

Chapter II *Patterns of Settlement* *12*

Chapter III *Social Groups and Ranking* *47*

Chapter IV *Gods in Relation to Human Society* *83*

Chapter V *Kinship, Marriage and Social Organization* *108*

Chapter VI *Occupational Divisions, Gahapati and Money* *167*

Conclusions *199*

Notes *202*

Bibliography *243*

Index *251*

Chapter I
Introduction

IN this study we present our observations on the social structure of the period which is so intimately connected with the personality of the Buddha. At this stage our research mainly centers on an analysis of the patterns of society. We follow the social scientists who study contemporary societies and maintain that the description of a society can best be made through assuming the existence of a "pattern." We are fully aware that, unlike some social scientists, we do not aim to draw from our studies any laws either of the society or human behaviour. We must be content, at least for the time being, with a description of society as depicted in the Pāli Canon, which helps us and others to understand it.

There are, of course, limitations to this kind of study. Our sources consist of a mass of literary material which is mainly religious in character. The formation of the Pāli Canon, which is our main source, is associated traditionally with at least two councils, one taking place at Rājagaha immediately after the death of the Buddha, and the other held at Vesāli one hundred years later.[1] The Canon was committed to writing in Sri Lanka under King Vaṭṭagāmaṇi (Cir. 100 B.C.).[2] The bulk of the canonical literature, especially the major portions of the *Sutta* and *Vinaya Piṭakas*, belong to the pre-Asoka period. Striking evidence in this connection is provided by the Bhabra Edict of Asoka, wherein he urges the Buddhist monks and nuns to make a special study of seven selected passages. Four of the passages have been identified as being in the first four *Nikāyas*, one in the *Vinaya* and the rest in the *Sutta Nipāta.*[3] The exact correspondence of the contents of the Edict and the Pāli texts, as we have them in their present form, is difficult to establish. Nevertheless, it certainly shows that Asoka knew a number of Pāli texts, some of which must have been identical with those found

in the *Nikāyas* and the *Sutta Nipāta.*[4]

Speaking of the antiquity of the Pāli Canon whose contents may have been older than the 2nd century B.C., A.K. Warder remarks:

> A comparison with the Prakrit inscriptions show that the Pāli language is closest to the earliest records (e.g. preservation of intervocalic consonants, without voicing), and it may therefore be regarded as having flourished in and probably before the Moriyan period. The canonical texts...have the appearance of standing close to a living language rather than of being artificial production in a dead language, like their commentaries, and therefore would seem to belong to the period when that language flourished.[5]

Our account of the social structure of this period is based mainly on the first four *Nikāyas*, the *Vinaya* and the *Sutta Nipāta* of the Canonical texts. Rhys Davids feels that the four *Nikāyas* and the *Vinaya* belong to the same chronological strata (about 100 years after the death of the Buddha). That this was so he has shown from the internal unity of the books demonstrable through material contained, formal struture and so on.[6] The fifth *Nikāya*, which contains miscellaneous texts, does not appear to have been recognised by schools other than the *Theravāda* and is a supplementary *Nikāya.*[7] Commenting on the usefulness of the *Nikāyas*, G.C. Pande says, "The *Nikāyas* appear to reflect the first and the earliest period of the history of Buddhist thought when the Saṅgha was, in appearance at least, doctrinally one." "It has, of course," he adds, "to be remembered that particular versions of the *Nikāyas* may be expected to contain much editorial retouching, addition and even expurgation."[8]

The *Vinaya Piṭaka* consists of (1) *Sutta Vibhaṅga* (2) *Khandakas* (3) *Parivāra* (4) *Pātimokkha.* It exists in different versions which belong to different sects. *Pātimokkha* is practically the same for all the sects. But the agreement is supposed to extend to the *Vibhaṅga* and even *Khandakas.*[9] *Parivāra* is more or less an index to the *Vinaya* and is, therefore, later in time than the other sections of the *Vinaya.*[10] Also in the *Cullavagga* of

Khandakas, the chapters dealing with the convening of the two Buddhist councils are generally considered as later additions to the original book.[11] About the relationship between the *Sutta Nipāta* and the prose *Nikāyas*, apart from the evidence of passages common to both the sets of books, N.A. Jayawickrame comments, "The social conditions reflected in the *Sutta Nipāta* regarding peoples and castes, countries and towns, brahmins and sacrifice are no different from those in the prose *Nikāyas*."[12] The material contained in the *Nikāyas*, *Vinaya*, and *Sutta Nipāta*, for our purpose may roughly be taken as reflecting the condition of the period between cir. 400-300 B.C.[13] Scholars like Richard Fick, T.W. Rhys Davids, A.N. Bose, and R.N. Mehta, in their study of the social history of the Buddha's time, have mainly relied on the *Jātakas*, though often they have included the evidence of the *Vinaya* and the *Nikāyas*. Some of the *Jātaka* stories contain very old legends, but generally they represent an extensive period of development from the Buddha's time down to the 2nd or 3rd century A.D.[14] Rhys Davids has analysed the internal evidence of the *Jātakas* and has shown that in the first two volumes the majority of the stories are simple narratives, but they become complicated and long-winded in the third, fourth, and fifth volumes.[15] Commenting on this lack of homogeneity in the *Jātakas*, Maurice Winternitz says,"Not only every large section and every single narrative, but often also every single *gāthā* will have to be tested independently, as regards its age."[16] The *gāthās* (verses) of the *Jātakas* have been generally accepted as constituting the oldest stratum. On the other hand, the late prose portions show marked signs of editing, perhaps at the hands of the Buddhist monks.[17] Having considered this vagueness in the chronology of the *Jātakas*, we have decided not to include them in the present study. However, the *Nikāya* and *Vinaya* material can safely be taken as a reliable guide to conditions during 400-300 B.C.

As a rule, facts given in detail or the exposition of points in the commentaries have been left out entirely, or are mentioned only incidentally when the points are too obscure and need elucidating. In one or two places we have compared the findings of our texts with those of the

commentaries.

We examine briefly the contents of our sources.

Vinaya books contain rules of behaviour for the monks and nuns as laid down by the Buddha. The rules are in the form of a number of stories in which a monk or a nun (a stock character) behaves improperly. There is gossip which ultimately reaches the Buddha. The Buddha makes a rule.

Dīgha Nikāya contains discourses by the Buddha and other monks. They contain parables, similes and anecdotes giving sociological data, descriptions, objective observations and religious advice.

Aṅguttara Nikāya is mainly concerned with numerical categorisations. All items appearing here have from one to eleven subdivisions, i.e. there are seven types of wives, five types of goal for a brāhmaṇa, eight paths of knowledge, four types of concentration, four ways of losing and gaining wealth.

Majjhima Nikāya contains religious and philosophical controversies. It also deals with the brāmaṇic claim to social and ritual superiority.

Saṃyutta Nikāya deals with the behaviour of groups and individuals who were the associates of the Buddha. It provides descriptions of groups and life stories of individuals, and also the discourses they have with the Buddha and with one another.

Sutta Nipāta is a collection of verses containing religious doctrine.

Much of the sociological material which can be abstracted from these is in the form of similes, stories, direct verbal statements and objective observations. Very little material is directly in the form of sociological description and even that is highly formalised. It is also repetitive and occurs at several places. A significant point is that the very incidental nature of our material increases its value as a historical source.[18]

As against this literary background, we find the solid testimony of archaeological finds which may be related to the period we examine. The excavation of Rājagaha, the city so intimately connected with the Buddha's life, was conducted in the year 1905. The city had outer stone walls 25 to 30 miles in circumference on an average 8 feet tall

and 16 feet wide, with superstructures of bricks and also several stone watch towers. A road paved with stone, stone wells and a number of stone foundations of buildings were also found at Rājagaha.[19] The recent excavations at Rājagaha have unearthed the foundations of the Jīvakārāmavana (the monastery buildings donated by the famous physician Jīvaka).[20] The excavations at Kosāmbi (1957-59) have revealed the existence of Ghositārāma, a high rampart around the city and the stone fortress of Udayana. [21]

George Erdosy has recently reviewed the chronology of the urban sites associated with the Buddha such as Kāsi (Vārāṇasi), Rājagaha, Sāvatthi, and Vesāli. He observes that of the six great cities stated in the Pāli texts–Campā, Rājagaha, Sāvatthi, Sāketa, Kosāmbi and Vārāṇasi– "only Kāsi (Rājaghāṭa) and Campā can be assumed to possess fortifications by the fifth century B.C., while the rest must be dated to the fourth century B.C. at the earliest;" the cities became fully evolved urban centres only from the latter period.[22] Thus the relative chronology of the *Nikāyas* and *Vinaya* (400-300 B.C.), deducible by textual analysis, more or less, synchronises with the recent archaeological data.

In a seminal article, Heinz Bechert has questioned 486 B.C. as the date of the Buddha's *parinibbāna.* He argues that the Buddha may have died between 355 and 375 B.C. The implication of Bechert's reexamination of the dates to our study is considerable. If, for instance, the texts, used in the present book, were composed soon after the Buddha's death, then they would likely to reflect the conditions which were nearer to the Buddha's life and times. In this context, it is noteworthy that the Theravāda tradition asserts that the *Nikāyas* and *Vinaya* were compiled in the first Buddhist council convened shortly after the Buddha's *parinibbāna.*[23]

The existence of the urban centres presupposes extensive agricultural lands to support them, the use of cash economy, the division and specialisation of labour and a growing awareness of social stratification based on riches, power or ritual status, or combinations of these attributes.[24] As Romila Thapar has stated, the semitribal,

lineage based political structures of the Vedic society had given way to the relatively stable state formations.[25] We find the petty states constantly engaged in territorial wars and power struggles. The Magadha and Kosala had emerged as the wealthiest and most powerful states of the region, constantly seeking to expand their territories by drawing into orbit the quasi-republics and smaller states.[26] To a greater or lesser extent, these necessary accompaniments of urban life have been projected in our literature.

We have used the principles of social anthropology, probably for the first time for this kind of historical research, only as a framework of reference under which "descriptions" will be subsumed. Each of our chapters has an introduction which broadly explains the nature of its contents. Some of them have summaries and conclusions. As far as possible we have avoided direct comparisons with modern data compiled in the sociological studies of the modern village-urban societies of India and elsewhere. However, we must understand the functioning of the modern Indian caste society in a city or a village in order to acquire a deeper insight into the past. It is equally incumbent on an anthropologist to know the "history" of our "time-honoured" institutions.

In the second part of our introduction we have outlined the use of social anthropological methods in the study of history. Some of the points or suggestions made there, have been used in our research. The others may prove to be useful in future research, or else may be considered as points of general illustration on methodology.

Anthropological Framework and Historical Analysis

We postulated that it was our intention to use social anthropological methods – to be more precise the methods of social structural analysis in our approach to historical data. This needs more elucidation. In connection with this two questions arise:

What are the methods available to current anthropology in its study of societies and what has dictated our choice? (2) What are some of the more detailed characteristics of the methods of social analysis?

Broadly speaking two different approaches are made nowadays to study social phenomena. (a) We can study the social structure. (b) We can make a global approach and make a descriptive study of all the phenomena that we come across: social relations, art, religion, philosophy, material culture and so on.[27] This method does not enable us to isolate one set of social phenomena like social relations and correlate it with other sets like ideas and material culture and in this way link changes in one with changes in the other. But fundamentally this method is alien to our purpose, which is primarily to study the social structure of a given society at a given time and if possible to trace changes in the structural relationships. Hence the global method, the method of study of the "total culture," as it is called, is ruled out for us by the very limits that we have set to our aims. There is, therefore, no question of arguing about which method is better in this context.

We have now to discuss some of the more detailed characteristics of the method of structural analysis and deal with certain criticisms of it. This method of structural analysis, generally speaking, deals with the isolation of regular patterns of behaviour as between persons and groups. In this way we try to see if there are, for instance, any regular patterns of behaviour between husband and wife, father and son, pupil and teacher, aristocrat and farmer. When we observe such regular patterns, we summarise the set of individual relationships and describe it as a structural relationship. The word "norm" can be used in this context. But we have to be careful to distinguish between the two uses of the word "norm." It can be used in the sense of "the average" as above, or in the sense of the "ideal." In all cases where the "norm" as an ideal does not coincide with the "norm" as "the average" behaviour pattern, we must note the difference. It may also be necessary to explain the difference. Thus the norm as ideal may be to uphold the joint family and the norm as average may be to set up the nuclear family.

The theory of studying regular patterns between persons and group received its greatest initial impetus from Raddliffe-Brown. His successors have discussed technical questions as to the level at which such studies should be

conducted: lineage, extended family, nuclear family, and interpersonal relationships.[28] Some have stated that only the larger groups like lineages, kinship groupings and political groupings should form the level of structural studies, as they represent more stable and larger groupings. Others have differed and included groupings like the nuclear family pattern. Here we must exercise judgement. A choice has to be made while endeavoring to gather data about the larger kinship and political grouping. We shall also include the nuclear family and smaller groupings. We shall exclude the study of groupings smaller than these, such as relations of friendship etc. We shall also leave out, generally, groupings larger than the political area we have circumscribed for our study. Our analysis will be conditioned by the limits we have set up for ourselves, and in assessing them note has to he made of these limits. Apart from discussions on the level of structural analysis made above, the successors of Radcliffe-Brown discussed a number of other questions which are relevant to our inquiry.

I

The first is the concept of "role playing." We mentioned that structural anthropologists sought to find the more regular pattern of behaviour between persons and groups. This was more or less Radcliffe-Brown's statement of aims. Relationships between groups, however, Nadel explained, were achieved through individuals "playing roles." This was the case, of course, in interpersonal relationships also. He tried to clarify the concept of "role playing" in order to make the technique of investigation more precise:"We, arrive at the structure of a society through abstracting from the concrete population and its behaviour the pattern (network, system) of relationships obtaining between actors in their capacity of playing roles relative to one another."[29] From this "role playing" we can generalise what is the average or the "norm" as we discussed before, whether there are opposing "norms," and whether the "average" conflicts with the "ideal" or not. This is really a deepening of our definition. But it is a useful technique in historical studies as it can show the

emergence of divergences and social change, and perhaps the reasons for them. Historical data like ours consists of both "the average" and "the ideal." It is desirable to distinguish between the two. The brāhmaṇical law books set down the "ideal" rather than "the average." Much of Buddhist literature contains both. We can detect changes in "ideals" by changes in succeeding law books. The historian then faces the question of explaining these changes and inferring social facts from them, provided data is available. His inference, of course, may range from the "more probable" to "the less probable."

II

This second theoretical issue taken up by social anthropologists after Radcliffe-Brown was the latter's concept of "function." It appears that he held *a priori* that all structural relationships existed to maintain and preserve existing society. Historians noting social change will naturally differ. The general trend among social anthropologists now is to take a more sophisticated view of function and note the existence of "dysfunction," of trends which lead to changes in structural relationship.

There have been other views on the meaning of the word "function." Some have deprived it of any purposive connotation or effect and have merely regarded it as synonymous with activity. We shall not concern ourselves with these discussions on "function." For our purpose we shall try to discover whether there are activities which seek to preserve a certain structure and others which seek to change it. A question of interest to us in this context is: "Were there changes in relations to Brāhmaṇas, in our area and period, and if so, to what extent?"

In connection with this we must state that our data, as well as the study of modern peasant societies, forces us to abandon the notion of a single closely related social structure. We find it more helpful to recognize the existence of a plurality of structures in a certain geographical area and time, and see if any relations exist between them or not. There may be two political states in an area otherwise structurally similar and consequently cannot be subsumed

under the head of a single social structure. The area we have dealt with is *Majjhimadesa* which has been described more fully in Chapter II.

III

The third development in structural theory which is of considerable significance to us is the link between groups of persons (from which we abstract structure) and the aims and activities conducted by these groupings, i.e. institutions. For current anthropology merely to describe structure and leave out institutions is incomplete as description.[30] It does not enable us to establish possible corelations. From the point of view of historical analysis "institutions" do form a large part of our data and have to be analysed and explained if possible. As data they are relatively more available than structural relationships, which have often to be inferred. The type of institutional data like "celibacy among monks" is relatively more plentiful than data on the organization of monasteries and the relationships between monks and laymen. The technique of analysis proposed by Nadel is helpful to our purpose, as it enables us to make use of inference where data is scarce.[31] He postulates that in society we observe "individuals in co-activity."

From this we mainly isolate two aspects: (1) Type of institutional activity. (2) The social group which carries out this institutional activity and the relation within this group.

Analysis has to be conducted on both levels (1) and (2) and if possible linked. Where only groupings are mentioned in historical data we may try to search for institutional activity. Where institutional activity is mentioned, we may search for the groups involved in it. We may also classify institutions and relate them. For example, we may relate social class to the economic structure.

In describing groupings we may examine (a) the internal order of groups and (b) the external order of groups.

Having briefly stated our scope, and the theoretical premises behind our approach and techniques, let us state more precisely what we do not intend to do. Current British structural anthropology has been criticized by

others, particularly Americans, on a number of issues which include neglect of questions of child training, psychology, technology and linguistics and disinterest in history.[32] We stated before that we have deliberately avoided the method of a "global" cultural study. We mention this criticism in passing in order that our use of structural analysis of groupings and institutions should not raise the same criticisms. Theoretically we are interested in questions of child training and psychology but are doubtful if the necessary data is currently available. We have deliberately left out that part of linguistics which deals with the history of words from our scope because we shall not be in a position to find any relations between it and social structure in our present enquiry. However, we have used the methods of socio-linguistics in our study of ranking and status. We have at the outset narrowed our field with respect to details of technological development. With respect to history, of course, our attempt is precisely to see if certain approaches and techniques used by this school of social anthropologists are applicable or not, i.e. to answer the criticism made.

The applicability of such techniques depends, of course, on their number, variety, relevance and refinement. Given a certain amount of data, analysis could be progressively deepened and widened. Thus we can proceed from level to level. We shall confine ourselves in this work to a certain level, if for no other reason than that of space. This does not, however, imply that a deeper analysis is not possible. The second shortcoming has been mentioned before, but we can mention it again in this context, that, compared to current field data, historical data is always more or less limited. Inference can be resorted to, but it will inevitably be in terms of greater or lesser probability. This we believe is a task historians must now shoulder. The use of the approach and techniques outlined above, we hope, may show a new and interesting aspect of historical research.

Chapter II
Patterns of Settlement

IN trying to understand the life of a community we must begin at some specific point. In our study we are faced with a large and, as it appears to us, nebulous society. Our aim is to trace the network of relationships, bounded ultimately only by the limits of the area covered by expansion of contemporary Aryan culture, which connects one individual, familial group or small settlement with others. Such a network of institutionalised relationships is present in every local group, whether it be a village, town or a city, for "the townsman and rustic dwell in the same community but lead somewhat different lives."[1] It is for this reason that we attempt to discover the patterns of settlement in the Buddhist society.

In the Pāli texts there are numerous references to cities, towns, villages, where the Buddha or his disciples stayed for a while and preached to the people. It is not unlikely that the records of these journeys are based upon a precise and detailed tradition and they can be substantially corroborated from present day topographical and historical knowledge. Jennings observes,"Though there is doubtless a superstructure of fictitious localities, claims and incidents set down among the *Sutta*, the conviction of the general truth of the itineraries, however, remains...."[2] Our primary interest, however, is not in the topography or the history of the specific towns, cities or villages, but only in the social characteristics of the settlements described. In so far as evidence permits us to contrast one town with another, one city with another and one village with another, we shall do so in order to discover any additional characteristics we may find.

There are a number of terms in the Pāli texts which refer to local groupings of one sort or another, the meanings of which are not always clear. We shall, therefore, attempt to attribute a meaning to each of them by analysing, among

other things, its relationship with the social groups of which we have some knowledge. Whenever possible, we shall also examine the economic aspect of the local groupings.

Gāma

We find the term *gāma* not infrequently used in our texts. The English rendering of *gāma* invariably as a village is inadequate, as the term has been used in more than one sense. For instance, it may mean a ward, a hamlet, a temporary settlement, etc. As we shall see, we have references to various types of *gāmas* and each type is a unit of social recognition.

Vinaya writers define a *gāma* which may consist of single *kuṭi*, two *kuṭis*, three *kuṭis* or four *kuṭis*.[3] The term *kuṭi* is normally translated as a hut, usually made of sticks, grass and clay (daub and thatch).[4] However, *kuṭi*, when mentioned as a *gāma*, cannot be a single cabin or little hut. A *gāma* of one *kuṭi* (*eka kuṭiko gāmo*) then, would probably refer to a hamlet of one large settlement perhaps surrounded by a few smaller buildings in which the dependants and servants of the family dwelt.[5] Most likely, this and the *gāmas* of two or three or four *kuṭis* were dispersed settlements in the forests, outlying woodlands, hilly tracks and mountainous areas which surrounded the rich plains of the Gangā valley. These hamlets had to be reckoned with because the *bhikkhus* and other ascetics stayed in them or had to depend on them for their maintenance. That this was so can be seen from the fact that some of the *bhikkhus* are described as forest-dwelling (*āraññako bhikkhu*)[6] and some of them are specifically referred to as staying in the forest *kuṭis*.[7] Aggika *Jaṭila*, an ascetic of the type following orthodox Vedic practises of fire worship, lives in a *kuṭi* and comes out of his forest abode perhaps to replenish his provisions.[8] The ancient brāhmaṇas go into the forest, build *kuṭis* of leaves and depend for their livelihood on the outlying *gāma–nigama–rājadhāni* and meditate.[9] The Bhikkhus construct *kuṭis* in the mountains of Isigili, (near Rājagaha) spend four months of the rainy season in there,

and when leaving, demolish the *kuṭis.*[10]

There are *gāmas* which are inhabited by the people and those which are devoid of them.[11] I.B. Horner interprets this type of *gāma* as "a village with human beings and a village with beings who are not human."[12] She supports her statement by taking the word *amanussa* to mean a *yakkha*, spirit or ghost.[13] It may be supposed that the deserted *gāmas* are often the haunts of *yakkhas* and in that sense they were inhabited by non-human beings. But these non-human beings seem to have been thought of as present in every *gāma.* Thus in one instance, the Buddha enjoins the *nāgas* and *yakkhas* that they should not maltreat *gāmas* and *nigamas* because if they did so they would not get hospitality and respect.[14] It was reputed of the Buddha that in whatever *gāma* and *nigama* he stayed there the non-human beings did the humans no harm.[15] We believe that the idea of the *gāmas* being deserted is the predominant one in the phrase *amanusso gāmo.* We are, therefore, inclined to translate *amanusso* as that which is without people, a deserted place, thus retaining its literal meaning. Examples of people deserting their *gāmas* are not lacking in the texts. We find *gāmas* burnt by fire or flooded by water.[16] A man sees a barren *gāma*, and whatever house he may enter he finds empty, deserted and void. Thereupon that man might be told that this was so because of the fear of robbers.[17] Because of the apprehension of robbers, a *gāma* comes to be removed and is split into two.[18] Aṅgulimāla, the highwayman, makes *gāmas* into *agāmas* (no *gāma*).[19] There are *gāmas* with surrounding walls and some without walls. This is yet another definition of *gāma* given by the *Vinaya* writers.[20] The walls seems to have been three kinds, of bricks, stone and wood.[21]

The reference to the *goṇisādinivitṭho gāmo* seems interesting.[22] This term has been wrongly rendered by I.B. Horner as "a village arranged fortuitously."[23] According to the Pāli dictionary the term *goṇisādika* is an ox-stall and the word *goṇisādi* has a similar sense.[24] *Goṇisādinivitṭho gāmo*, therefore, would indicate organised cattle establishment or farm which formed a *gāma.*[25] These permanent cattle camps are different from temporary ones, which are called *vaja.* Thus the monks spend the rainy

season in a *vaja*. When the *vaja* is removed, the monks go to another *vaja*.[26]

A *goṇisādiniviṭṭho gāṃo* was most probably inhabited by people who tended and lived with the cattle. Thus the brāhmaṇa Dhāñanjāni managed his dairy outside the town. He was getting his cows milked when the monk Sāriputta visited him. Gopaka Moggallāna brāhmaṇa also indulges himself with the similar occupation.[27] In the *Sutta Nipāta*, we find a cattleman Dhaniya who says that "he lives by his own earnings and is nobody's servant."[28] He is to be distinguished from the ordinary herdsman known as *gopāla* [29] or *govinda* [30] who was hand hired to look after the cattle.

A caravan camping more than four months is called a *gāma*.[31] This is the last settlement to be defined in the *Vinaya* under the heading of *gāma*. Obviously, this indicates the practise of the caravans to stop at places for a considerable period. Some of the caravans belonged to merchants who conveyed their goods right across the country. Often the land was beset with dangers and it was great relief to find inhabited areas after a long journey through deep forests.[32] In the *Dīgha Nikāya*, we find a caravan called *sakaṭo sattho* (caravan of wagons) managed by a thousand men.[33] A regular caravan road is referred to in the *Vinaya*.[34] The *bhikkhus* were allowed to pass the rainy season with a caravan.[35] It is but natural that some of the caravans, at least the larger of them, halted for a period lasting more than four months. These caravans had to extend the period of their stay presumably because of their considerable business transactions which involved buying and selling. Bad transport facilities may have been another cause for the prolonged stay.

There is yet another possibility that this type of settlement may also refer to wandering bands of gypsy-like people. The following instance suggests this.[36] Aggika *Jaṭila* knows a group of people who are migrating. The *Jaṭila* goes to the caravan camp (*sattha vāso*) with the intention of getting some food from them, not knowing that the caravan had moved on the previous night. However, he sees there an abandoned child lying on its back. With compassionate heart, the *Jaṭila* carries this baby to the forest hermitage and rears it.[37] This reference

to the young child left behind alone suggests that the wanderers followed the custom of child exposure which is still found in some of the wandering bands of India.

The evidence of the commentary on the Jain Canonical literature, although it may not correspond to the age of our texts, is nevertheless worthy of notice. The Jain text mentions five types of caravan travellers (1) those who carried their goods by carts and wagons (b*haṇḍi*), (2) who carried their goods by camels, mules, and bullocks, (3) who carried their own loads (*bhāravāha*), (4) wandering people who travelled to earn their livelihood and went from place to place (*odariya*) and (5) the *Kārapāṭika* ascetics.[38] When the *Vinaya* writers mentioned caravan settlements,[39] most probably they had in their minds the type numbers 1 and 4 of the Jain Canonical literature.

Specialization seems to have been a particular feature of the age. We find, therefore, a growing tendency of the people of similar occupations and professions to group together and organize. The process of urbanization must inevitably lead people into this. This also led people of similar interests to live in settlements. The formation of a *gāma* out of the professional group is illustrated by an example from the *Vinaya.* [40] King Bimbisāra of Magadha expresses his wish to the monk Pilindavaccha to give an attendant for a park. But soon afterwards he forgets about this incident. Remembering after a time, he asks a minister who is concerned with all the affairs of state whether a park attendant whom he promised to be given to the Buddha has been given. The king is told that it has not been done, and it is 500 days since he last gave his promise to Pilindavaccha. Under the king's instruction, the minister hands over five hundred park attendants to Pilindavaccha. A distinct *gāma* establishes itself.[41] They even call the settlement the *gāma* of park attendants and also Pilindagāma, after the monk.[42] The number five hundred, both for the people and the days, is doubtful. It may be conventional, implying a sizable group of park attendants with their families,[43] presumably attending to all the parks in the city of Rājagaha.

A *gāma* of reed makers (*naḷakāra*) is situated near the city of Sāvatthi,[44] and a *gāma* of salt makers (*loṇakāra*) is to be

found near Kosāmbi.[45] Although we do not have any direct reference to a *gāma* of actors (*naṭa*),[46] we can deduce from the fact that as the actors had *gāmaṇis* (headmen of the *gāmas*) they must have had *gāmas*. In the same way as we have *gāmas* of elephant and cavalry units,[47] they must have grouped themselves into a *gāma*. *Gāmas* in the above cases indicate a group of professional people settling in bands:

Gāma and Kin-group

A *gāma* may belong to one particular kin-group and may in turn be known as the *gāma* of that group. Thus a kin-group may also acquire the name of a *gāma*. We can discern this from the following case:[48]

> Not far from Vesāli there is a *gāma* called Kalandaka. In that *gāma* Sudinna, the Kalandakaputta, is the son of a *seṭṭhi* (*seṭṭhiputta*).[49] Sudinna goes to Vesāli with many friends. Sudinna becomes a monk and lives, dependant on a certain *gāma* of the Vajjis. At that time the Vajjian region is short of alms food, for there is a famine. Sudinna goes to Vesāli and stays there because he is sure that his *ñāti* (members of the extended kin-group) in the city will give him food, which they do. One fine morning he enters the *gāma* of Kalandaka for alms and comes to his parental residence (*sakapitu nivesanam*). A female slave of Sudinna's *ñāti* (*ñātidāsi*), while throwing away the previous evening's barley gruel, sees Sudinna and recognizes him. Immediately she runs to Sudinna's mother and tells her that Sudinna is back. In the meantime Sudinna is busy eating the barley gruel in the room provided for that purpose. Sudinna's father, coming from his work, sees Sudinna and requests him to go to his own house.

We may note few points from this case. (1) It is significant that Sudinna is known as Kalandakaputta as well as a *seṭṭhiputta*, but his *gāma* affiliation is recognized by his *ñāti* from Vesāli who refer to him as Sudinna Kalandakaputto. (2) When Sudinna approaches his parental residence, his *ñāti's* female slave sees him. Also when

Sudinna's father calls him home, he asks Sudinna to come to his own house (*sakaṃ geham*). Thus the household was large and within it there was a *ñāti* who had a female slave. The slave did not belong to his own parents. The term residence (*nivesa*), in this connection should be taken to mean a residential area. We have thus within a unit of a *gāma* , which belonged to a *ñāti*, sub-units such as residential areas, most probably enclosed and attached to individual households.[50] Apparently the room provided for the almsgiving, called *kuddamulaṃ* , was common to all.

In the *Majjhima Nikāya* a somewhat similar case is to be found, but this has also other implications:[51]

> A brāhmaṇa youth is described as Subha Toḍeyyaputta. He visits the Buddha, and during the talks, which took place in the city of Sāvatthi, the Buddha addresses him as *Subha* and *brāhmaṇa.* After the discussions, Subha Toḍeyyaputta meets the brāhmaṇa Jāṇussoṇi of Sāvatthi. Jāṇussoṇi, however, addresses him as *Bhāradvāja* (i.e. by his *gotta* name).

We have here two systems of recognition of status operating side by side. In the secular circle, Subha was another brāhmaṇa, whose status was indicated by his *gāma* name.[52] On the other hand, he was called by his *gotta* name, Bhāradvāja, within his own group of the brāhmaṇas. The key to the explanation is to be found in the modern usage. In modern times in India, a brāhmaṇa who goes to another village is known as the brāhmaṇa of a certain village. But when he meets another brāhmaṇa, the sub-division of the brāhmaṇa comes into effect.

Brāhmaṇa gāmas

The brāhmaṇa villages or settlements were mainly in the Magadhan and Kosalan regions. Brāhamaṇa *gāmas* such as Ekasāla,[53] Khānumata,[54] and Pañcasālā[55] were in Magadha. In Kosala we encounter Iccānaṅkala,[56] Veḷudvāra,[57] Opasāda,[58] Nagaravinda,[59] Venāgapura,[60] Sālā,[61] and Manasākaṭa.[62] The mention of these brāhmaṇa *gāmas* in the above two regions does not necessarily indicate that in other regions the presence of the brāhmaṇa was

insignificant; these were places where the brāhmaṇas were presumably a dominant group both numerically and politically.

The reason for the presence of the brāhmaṇa *gamas* in these two regions is likely to be found in the early development of *brahmadeyya* landownership in those areas. *Brahmadeyya* was the royal gift of land or an estate to well known brāhmaṇas and others, for the services, probably ritual in nature, which they rendered to the king. Some of the *brahmadeyya* lands are specifically described as brāhmaṇa *gāmas*. Khānumata and Opasāda[63] which are given respectively by kings Pasenadi and Bimbisāra to the brāhmaṇa Kuṭadanta and Caṅki, are thus described. On the other hand, Campā, Ukkaṭṭha and Sālavaṭikā,[64] although these places belong to the brāhmaṇa Soṇadaṇḍa, Pokkharasādi and Lohicca respectively, are known only as *brahmadeyya* lands.[65] The ownership rights of the brāhmaṇas coupled with their residence seem clear in the first instance. In the second only the ownership rights seem to have been uppermost in the minds of the writers. We suggest that the brāhmaṇa *gāmas*, at their inception, were the lands given as gifts to the brāhmaṇas by the kings. In course of time, because of the settlements of other brāhamaṇa families in those areas, they became known as brāhmaṇa *gāmas*. The mention of brāhmaṇa *gāmas* as existing only in Kosala, and Magadha, both under monarchical rule,[66] seems to support our view.

The predominance of brāhmaṇas in the brāhmaṇa *gāmas* is obvious. The following instances will elucidate our point. We have brāhmaṇa-*gahapatis* [67] mentioned in all the brāhmaṇa *gāmas* and, although the latter are referred to elsewhere in the texts,[68] it is only in the brāhmaṇa *gāmas* that we find them addressed as *gahapatis*, thus seemingly emphasizing the role of the brāhmaṇas in these villages both as *gahapatis* and brāhmaṇas. Besides the brāhmaṇa-*gahapatis*, we find many hundreds of brāhmaṇas from various parts of the country residing temporarily in Opasāda and Khānumata.[69] Well known brāhmaṇas such as Caṅki, Tārukkha, Pokkharasādi, Jāṇussoṇi and Toḍeyya sojourn at Manasākaṭa and Iccānaṅkala.[70] In Pañcasālā, brāhmaṇa householders do not offer food to the Buddha

even at festival time.[71] Incidentally, this is the sole reference in the text where the Buddha is refused food on his begging round. And that, too, very significantly in a brāhmaṇa *gāma.* In Iccānaṅkala the Buddha criticizes the claims of superiority of the brāhmaṇas over other classes on the basis of birth alone.[72] In Ekanālā, the farmer Bhāradvāja brāhmaṇa has so much land that he needs 500 ploughshares to plough it.[73]

Possibly because of their riches, some of the brāhmaṇa villages seem to have been fortified. The Buddha, commenting on the luxurious way of life led by the brāhmaṇas, brings to the notice of the brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha that the ancient brāhmaṇas lived in jungles and led a chaste and unpretentious life. In contrast to this, the brāhmaṇas of the present day lived in fortified places, guarded by men with swords.[74] The names of the brāhamaṇa *gāmas* such as Nagaravinda (fort, Vinda) and Venāgapura (fort, Venāga)[75] assume significance in the light of the Buddha's criticism.[76]

Gāma and Nigama

In the sphere of common activities, the two terms *gāma* and *nigama* are often mentioned together. That which is applicable to *gāma*, is also generally applicable to *nigama.* This may be gleaned from the following cases. In some cases *gāma* and *nigama* are both described as situated close to woods.[77] Men, oxen and cows might come and drink from the great lake near a *gāma* and *nigama.*[78] Boys and girls, coming out from the *gāma* and *nigama*, draw near to the pond, lift a crab from the water, and play with it.[79] A great heap of grain, presumably in a market place, happens to be near *gāma* or *nigama* from which people carry away corn on pingoes, in baskets, in their laps or in their hands. And if one should approach them and question them saying, "From where did you bring this corn?" The people would best explain the matter by saying, "We bring it from that great heap of grain near a *gāma* and *nigama.*"[80] A monk comes to be dependent on a *gāma* or *nigama* for alms.[81] The brāhmaṇas build their fire-houses (*aggyāgāra*) near the boundaries of a *gāma* or *nigama* and worship the fire.[82] A man who may have been absent a long time from his *gāma*

or *nigama*[83] may see a man recently come from that *gāma* or *nigama*. On seeing him, the first man would enquire about the safety, the plentifulness of food and the absence of sickness in his former *gāma* or *nigama*.[84] The other man would gladly lend his ear to these enquiries, for these would arouse in him feelings of fellowship, and he would then willingly associate with the former.[85] Both *gāmas* and *nigamas* have *gāmaṇis* as their headmen.[86]

In fact these two words *gāma* and *nigama* have been used more or less as synonyms. In one particular instance, they are even used as a compound. Vegaḷiṅga is thus described as *gāmanigama*.[87] But the size of a *nigama* seems to be somewhere between that of a *gāma* and that of a *nagara* (city) or *rājadhāni* (capital). Thus in his discourse to a brāhmaṇa, the Buddha advances a simile in which he says: A man wanting to go to Rājagaha might approach the brāhmaṇa who knows the way leading to Rājagaha. The brāhmaṇa would direct the way by saying, "My good man, this road goes to Rājagaha; go along it for a while; when you have gone along it for a while you will see a *gāma*. Go further for a while and you will see a *nigama*. When you have gone still further, you will see Rājagaha with its delightful parks and ponds."[88]

The term *nigama* has been variously rendered as a market town,[89] a town,[90] a township[91] and a district.[92] The Pāli dictionary derives the meaning from the Sanskrit root *gāma* with the prefix *ni*, having the sense of meeting, coming together.[93] In the Vedic literature we have no equivalent term for *nigama*, which probably corresponds to the Sanskrit term *mahāgrāma*, which is found in the contemporary *Sutra* literature.[94] We feel that if we take *gāmas* as settlements of kin-groups or occupational and professional groups, the *nigama* should be taken as a *gāma* composed of members of various groups, more or less integrated. The *nigama*, therefore, should be considered as a large and complex *gāma*, a bigger social and economic unit.

That the *gāma* could form an integral part of the *nigama* is very apparent from the following case. In one of his important self declarations the Buddha says: "Pursuing the good, seeking the supreme path of tranquility, I journeyed

by stages among the Magadhas and came to Uruvela, the *nigama* of the army (*senānigama*). There I saw a fair grove, and a clear flowing river, delightful and easy of approach, and finally a *gāma* in which to beg food. Here I settled, for here was everything needed for effort."[95] The *gāma* in army most probably refers to a settlement of a division of the army, references to which occur in the *Saṃyutta Nikāya.*[96] References to the traditional four-fold army are fairly frequent.[97] The existence of the army *nigama* thus sets for us a pattern to further clarify the nature of the *nigama*, in which we should expect to find the "living together" of more than one social group.

In a *nigama* of the Kurus, Thullakoṭṭhika, we find both brāhmaṇas and *gahapatis*, in this case identified as brāhmaṇa-householders. This is further supported by the fact that Raṭṭhapāla, who was present in the assembly of brāhmaṇas and *gahapatis* who had gathered to hear the Buddha preach, is mentioned as "the son of the leading family of Thullakoṭṭhikā."[98] His father was a *gahapati*, not a brāhmaṇa.[99] In Vegaḷiṅga *gāmanigama*, the brāhmaṇa Jotipāla is a friend of Ghaṭikāra, the potter, who stays with his blind and aged parents.[100] In Kammāsaddhaṃ, the Buddha puts up in the firehouse of a Bhāradvāja brāhmaṇa.[101] In Ātuma, the barber asks his sons to go around the community and gather food by offering their services, in order that he may give a meal to the Buddha.[102] In Āpaṇa, Keṇiya *Jaṭila* has many brāhmaṇa sponsors. The Buddha is, therefore, doubtful of Keṇiya's ability to provide a meal for him and his 1200 monks.[103]

In Khomadussa *nigama*, owing to sudden and unexpected rain, the Buddha enters the assembly hall (*sabhā*) while a meeting was in progress. The brāhmaṇa-*gahapatis* rebuke the Buddha for not knowing the laws of the assembly hall. The significant point in this passage is that this incident takes place in the *nigama* of the Sākyas who are most likely to be the politically dominant group in that *nigama.* And yet the brāhmaṇa *gahapatis* seem to maintain their separate existence.[104] We have dealt with this concept of dominance of extended groups in certain parts of our gregion elsewhere in this chapter.[105] In a *nigama* of the Mallas, the monk Ānanda has talks with the *gahapati*

Tapussa, the subject of the conversation being the welfare of the householders.[106]

The term *nigama* also appears in derivative nominal form *negama*, a body of persons connected with the *nigama*. This term occurs only with reference to cities like Rājagaha and Sāvatthi, and in that context *nigama* would indicate a ward in a city. *Nigama*, as we have pointed out earlier, is a *gāma* composed of members of various groups more or less integrated. In a city the *nigama* and the groups would have the same integrated relationship, but with one difference. Because of the urban complexities and the existence of the number of wards side by side, only a representative body, formed of the leading household heads (*gahapati*) could possibly effectively cooperate in the government of a city. Since the ruling council of a city came from *nigamas*, the word *negama* must have originated to denote the nature of that body.

The *negama* had access to the king. Twice they are recorded as presenting their cases before the king. The *negama* of Rājagaha, through the good offices of king Bimbisāra, instructs the physician Jīvaka to cure a *seṭṭhi gahapati*.[108] In the second instance, at their behest, Bimbisāra installs the courtesan Sīlāvati so that the city of Rājagaha may prosper through her fame.[109] As its members belonged to the well-to-do classes, it is but natural that the *negama* would help its class members. To the *gahapati* Anāthapiṇḍika they make offers of money to help him out of his difficulties when he invites the Buddha to a meal.[110] They help the *seṭṭhi gahapati* mentioned above because they think "he is very helpful to the *negama*."[111]

Pura and Nagara

The occurrence of the word *pura* is rare. In the *Sutta Nipāta*, a *yakkha* of Āḷavi declares that he will wander from *gāma* to *gāma* from *pura* to *pura*.[112] Immediately after his enlightenment, the Buddha plans to go to the "*pura* of the Kāsis" (*kāsīnaṃ puraṃ*) to beat the drum of deathlessness; it is further added that in due course he approaches Banaras.[113] These passages are considered to be

amongst the earliest ones in the Pāli Canon and it seems clear that in these *pura* means a city.

The word *nagara*, which is so commonly used for city in the Pāli texts, is said to have a non-Aryan origin.[114] This term in early Vedic literature is found only in the derivative adjective, used as proper name *nagarin*. It appears in the sense of a "town" in the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* and is frequently used in the later language.[115] As our subject does not include the origins of the word, we will confine our study to the nature of *nagara* in Pāli sources, where it is used to mean an inhabited place or area.

The *Vinaya* refers to a hypothetical case involving a theft.[116] The one responsible for the theft, among other punishments, will be either imprisoned or banished. The imprisonment (*bandheyyuṃ*) is defined as holding tight (the thief) by means of rope, fetters, and chains. He might be imprisoned within the *ghara* (house) *nagara*, *gāma* and *nigama*. The people might also appoint a guard of men to keep a watch on the thief.[117] However, he might be banished (*pabbājeyyuṃ*) from the *gāma*, *nigama*, *nagara*, *janapada* and *janapadadesa*. In the first instance the *nagara* means a fortified enclosure and is so used in its proper sequence, while on the other hand the territorial aspect of the *nagara* is apparent in the next one. This subtle distinction probably existed in the minds of the writers of the Canon and it seems to occur again in the passage where it is said that the robber Aṅgulimāla depopulated *gāmas*, *nigamas* and *janapadas*.[118] The reasons for not mentioning *nagaras*, which imply fortifications, seem to be obvious. Aṅgulimāla would find it difficult to attack places which were well fortified. In the days of political turmoil, in which "fish ethics" (*matsya ñāya*) in politics was the order of the day, it is not surprising that the major powers in the country should take such care for their defences.

Nagara in some cases is clearly a fortress rather than a city. One such fortress is described in the *Dīgha Nikāya*.[119] The king, it says, might have a frontier *nagara* strong in its foundations, rampart (*pākāra*) [120] and towers, and with only one gate and a gate keeper (*dovārika*).[121] The duties of the gate-keeper are specified: "He keeps off strangers and allows known persons to enter the fort. As he

patrols all round the fort he might not notice a crevice in the wall or a hole big enough for a cat to slip through. But would know whatever creatures of any size entered or left this fort would all enter or leave by this gate." In the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, the seven defences and the four kinds of supplies which make a king's frontier fortress impregnable, and the corresponding qualities in a monk who is unaffected by the evil insinuations of *māra*, are mentioned.[122]

In the *Mahāparinibbāṇa Sutta*, the monk Ānanda considers Kusināra as (1) a *kuḍḍa nagaraka* (2) an *ujjaṅgala nagaraka* or (3) a *sākhā nagaraka*. He suggests that the Buddha should not die in Kusināra but in a *mahānagara*, such as Campā, Rājagaha, Sāvatthi, Sāketa, Kosāmbi and Vārāṇasi.[123] Rhys Davids renders these *nagarakas* as (1) a little wattle and daub town, (2) a town in the midst of jungle and (3) a branch township, respectively.[124] He seems to have caught the general sense fairly enough but his rendering may be somewhat off the mark. It does not give us, for instance, any idea of the forms of architecture of the *nagara* represented by the Pāli words. We are inclined to believe that these words also specify three types of fortifications by which the *nagara* was known.

In *kuḍḍa-nagaraka*, the word *kuḍḍa* is connected with the Sanskrit root *kṣud*, to grind, and thus suggests a powdery substance of some kind used in construction. [125] It may, therefore, indicate a *nagara* with ramparts of mud bricks. *Ujjaṅgala* literally means hard, firm and barren soil. We prefer the explanation given in the *Peta Vatthu* which says," *Ujjaṅgala* is a very hard area of ground (*ativiya thadda bhumibhāga*)." to its alternative meaning of "sandy and deserted place."[126] *Ujjaṅgala nagaraka* thus would refer to the *nagaras* constructed on hilly terrains, as these afforded a natural protection. We might also find in such a *nagara* cyclopean walls. Rājagaha, the capital of Magadha, had two distinct towns, of which the older called Giribajja was a hill fortress, while the later town at the foot of the hill was known as Rājagaha proper. The walls of Giribajja are among the oldest known stone buildings in India.[127]

The third in the list of *nagarakas* mentioned above is *sākhā nagaraka*. The commonplace meaning of *sākhā* is a

branch of a tree.[128] The *sākhā nagaraka* may, therefore, be a type of *nagara* fortified by branches of trees which were presumably cut into stakes, sharpened at the end, and fastened together to construct a wall. Possibly this was the most common form of defence, owing to the ready availability of wood. That wood was widely used for fortification is clear from the following case. Dhaniya, a Buddhist monk of Rājagaha wants to build a house of wood. So he goes to the keeper of a wood-yard (*dārugahe gaṇakaṃ*) to beg for wood. The keeper tells him that the wood was held for king Bimbisāra, serving to repair the *nagara* in case of accident.[129] The city of Pāṭaliputta had wooden walls, the remains of which have been excavated.[130]

The relationship between *nagara* as a town and *nagara* as a fort or fortified enclosure is very close. In fact, the one cannot exist without the other. Thus, we find the brāhmaṇa ministers of the king of Magadha, Sunīdha and Vassakāra, building a *nagara* (fortress) at Pāṭaligāma to hold the Vajjis in check.[131] However, we cannot say that the whole of Pāṭaligāma was fortified. The meaning which seems to be more probable is that a fortress was built near Pāṭaligāma and in course of time, as mentioned in the text, that *gāma* became an *agganagara.*[132] Pāṭaligāma originally seems to have been a settlement of traders, and a small market.[133] Since it was between Vesāli and Rājagaha, it also had an important strategic position. It was on the confluence of the Gangā and Soṇā, one of its (Gangā) tributaries. In this passage, therefore, we seem to have the key to the understanding of a *nagara* as a city. This passage would indicate that in the beginning there is a *gama*, a *nagara* comes to be built near it and, because of economic and other factors, the *nagara* is extended and grows into a city.

We may recall that Ānanda identifies Kusināra as a *nagaraka.*[134] The word *nagaraka* is used as diminutive of *nagara* and in this context it would mean a small town. The occurrence of the word *nagaraka* with *mahānagara* indicates that the former was used only to bring about a sharp contrast between Kusināra and other cities such as Sāvatthi, Rājagaha and Kosāmbi. Kusināra seems to have

been a town with a fort, and it is likely that surrounding *gāmas* and *nigamas* would be left uncovered by the walls of the fort. It is more likely that ruling families – in this case the Mallās of Kusināra – would stay in the area covered by the walls of the fort, to guard themselves from external enemies, to protect themselves from their own subjects, and to maintain a social distance from the other groups. We may discern some of the points made above from the following instance:[135]

> Just before his death,the Buddha comes to Kusināra and stays in Upavattana, the *sāla*-grove of the Mallas. The Buddha instructs Ānanda to go and tell the Mallas of Kusināra the news of his sickness. Since the Buddha was staying in their land (*gāmakhetta*), the Buddha intentionally does this so that the Mallas should not feel hurt that they were not informed of the news of the Buddha's forthcoming death. The Mallas, on hearing the news from Ānanda, go to meet the Buddha.[136]
>
> The Mallas come with their sons, daughters-in-law, wives and entourage, forming their family circles (*kulaparivatta*). Ānanda thinks it useless to introduce the Mallas individually as that would have taken considerable time and instead he introduces them to the Buddha by family groups, each led by its head.
>
> After the Buddha's death, the monk Anuruddha sends Ānanda to announce the news. Ānanda starts in the morning (*pubbaṇa samayaṃ*) and arrives in Kusināra just before midday (*attadutiyo*).
>
> The Mallas mourn the Buddha's death, decorate his body and pay homage to it. On the seventh day they think of removing the body for cremation. They propose to take it with proper ceremony to the southern part of the *nagara* and to cremate it outside the *nagara* facing the south.[137] However, they cannot lift the body as a *devatā* intended differently. According to the wishes of the *devatā* they carry the body towards the north of the *nagara*, enter the *nagara* through the north gate, take the body to the centre of the *nagara*, leave by the eastern gate, and finally cremate the body towards the east of the *nagara* near

the Mukuṭabandhana, the ancestral shrine of the Mallas.[138]

The Mallas of Kusināra preserve the funerary deposits and elaborately put them in their Santhāgāra (assembly building). The other ruling powers of the region, when they hear the news of the Buddha's death in Kusināra, claim the remains of the body. The Mallas of Kusināra, however, claim the body on the ground that the Buddha died in the area of their settlement (*gāmakhetta*).

It is clear from this that in the area known as Kusināra there was a fort (*nagara*) and surrounding areas which were distinct from the fort. The town of Kusināra covered both of these. The Mallas seem to have lived in the fort with their families. The area of the town as a whole seems to have been considerable. Ānanda took a few hours to cover the distance between that part of Kusināra where the Buddha's body lay dead and the residence of the Mallas, their *nagara*. The account of the funeral procession is interesting. At first the Mallas seem to show reluctance to carry the body of the Buddha into the *nagara*, the rights of which they probably reserved for their own kinsmen. A *devatā* had to intervene to take the body of the Buddha into the *nagara* and to give it a place of honour by installing the body near the Mallan shrine, outside the city. This clearly shows that the Mallas held the *nagara* as their exclusive enclosure.

Nagara and Mahānagaras

The big cities are full of people and are great sources of wealth. In Ānanda's list of *mahānagaras*, we find six such cities mentioned: Campā, Sāvatthi, Rājagaha, Sāketa, Kosāmbi and Vārāṇasi. Ānanda seems to stress the importance of their wealth as he feels that the rich *gahapatis*, brāhmaṇas and *khattiyas* in these cities will do proper homage to the Buddha's body.[139] We find other cities such as Kapilavatthu and Vesāli which, although they do not come under the category of *mahānagara* are sufficiently important. Vesāli is prosperous and flourishing, full of people and well off for food. It contains

7707 *pāsādās*, 7707 *kuṭāgaras*, 7707 parks and 7707 lotus ponds. In it dwells the courtesan Ambapāli, beautiful and charming. She is cleaver at dancing, singing and lute playing, and much visited by the people, and through her Vesāli acquires fame.[140] Kapilavatthu, too, is rich and contains food and people in plenty. It is crowded with elephants, horses, chariots, carts and men, all swaying and rolling along.[141] The ideal city of Kusāvati, as presented by the Buddha, is more or less the same as Vesāli and Kapilavatthu. It is full of rattle and din of elephants, horses, chariots, various musical instruments such as trumpet (*bheri*), *viṇā*, and *muṭiṅga* and singing. In addition to these noises, we find there frivolity and merrymaking, with much eating and drinking.[142] Sudinna the monk goes to his relatives in Vesāli as he is sure that his *ñāti* in the city will give him food, which they do.[143] Vesāli is also known for its delightful shrines (*cetiya*) which were apparently popular pilgrimage centres for the people of Vajjis.[144]

The cities are characterised by affluence. To cure a disease of his head, the *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Rājagaha has to give 100,000 (coins) to the king and as many to the physician Jīvaka.[145] Jīvaka gets in all 16,000 *kahāpaṇas* and a few other gifts from the *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Sāketa for curing his wife.[146] The *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Banaras gives 16,000 *kahāpaṇas* to Jīvaka for curing his son.[147] Soṇa Kolivisa of Campā renounces "80 cart-loads of gold (*asītasakaṭavāha hiraññaṃ*)" and a herd of seven elephants, and joins a monastery.[148] In Sāvatthi,we find *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa and *gahapati mahāsālas*, men of authority, owning great treasure, great wealth, immense aids to enjoyment, immense supplies of goods and corn, deliberately telling lies through and because of and in connection with their worldly desires.[149] In Sāvatthi the *seṭṭhi gahapati* dies intestate, leaving behind him gold, worth 100,000 (*kahāpaṇas*), to say nothing of silver.[150] In all these cases the figures may be exaggerated but they imply the existence of extensive cash economy and the comparatively greater affluence of the big cities with respect to other inhabited places. There seems to be a tendency amongst the cities to vie with each other in

respect of wealth and prestige. Seeing the prosperity of Vesāli because of her courtesan Ambapāli, the toast of society, the *negama* (urban council) of Rājagaha appoints Sīlāvatī as their chief courtesan.[151] While Ambapāli charged fifty coins (*kahāpaṇas*) this Sīlāvatī took a hundred from her customers.[152]

In the cities, the examples of people bestowing lavish gifts on the Buddhist *saṃgha* and other religious orders are abundant. We give below but a few. The *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Rājagaha gives a meal to the Buddha, whereas his brother-in-law from Sāvatthi, Anāthapiṇḍika gives the entire Jetavana.[153] The *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Rājagaha presents sixty buildings for the monastery to the Buddhist *saṃgha.* [154] Even a poor worker in Vesāli has the ability to give a meal to the Buddha and his *saṃgha*, however, frugal it may have been.[155] In the city of Savātthi we find guilds (*pūga*) instituting a regular supply of food to the monks and nuns.[156] Cities were thus undoubtedly the great storerooms of wealth, which attrácted people of diverse interests, habits and origins.

The inhabitants of the cities seem to stay in quarters or wards (*nigama*), which they seem to have based on their own *nigamas* whence they originally came. We know very little about the relationship which existed between the people living in the city and in the *gāmas* and *nigamas* outside it. Kinship ties must have played a prominent part in deciding these relationships, but evidence to substantiate our hypothesis is lacking. At best we have a few hints which suggest this. Thus the monk Sudinna goes to his *ñātis* in Vesāli in case of difficulty. The *ñātis* fulfil their obligations by giving him food.[157] A nun who is in Sāvatthi sees *ñātaka* from her *gāma.*[158] Another nun from Sāvatthi quarrels with other nuns and goes to her *ñātikulāni* in a *gāma.*[159]

It is significant that *seṭṭhi gahapatis* are to be found only in the cities. *Gahapatis* are the household heads and well-to-do people. In the cities these household heads, or the more wealthy amongst them would be likely to categorise themselves into a class, or rather would be so categorised by the people. Thus the *seṭṭhi gahapatis* would mean the leading middle class *gahapatis* as distinct from the

brāhmaṇas by birth and the members of ruling aristocracy. Nowhere in the text we are told specifically of the profession of the *seṭṭhi gahapatis*, although they are generally taken as merchants. They are certainly wealthy enough to be able to afford costly gifts and fees.[160]

Janapada

Janapada is a term for a region comprising *gāma, nigama* and *nagara* and is often combined with these smaller territorial units. An often quoted simile of the Buddha runs as follows:

> A man sees a beautiful woman of the *janapada* (*janapada kalyāṇī*). He wants and desires her. Another man might say to the fir't man, "My good fellow do you know anything about her"? He asks various questions. The class of the *janapada kalyāṇī* is enquired about, whether she belonged to the *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa* or *sudda vaṇṇa*; her name and *gotta*; about her complexion, whether she is dark (*kāli*), fair (*sama*) golden (*mańgura*); and the last query is to what *gāma, nigama* or *nagara* she belonged.[161]

The order in which these questions about the *janapada kalyāṇī* are asked is interesting. It seems to reflect the whole structure of the *janapada* which should be understood as a socio-cultural region, a structural entity consisting of various subunits which start from *vaṇṇa*, and end with residential units of *gāma, nigama* and *nagara.* In the *Saṃyutta Nikāya,*[162] it is said that people (*bahujana*) flock together, crying *janapada kalyāṇī , janapada kalyāṇī.* Then that girl, displaying all her charms, dances and sings for them. Still more people might gather and bestow showers of praise upon her saying, "the *janapada kalyāṇī* sings and dances." This passage incidentally betrays the sense of unity which lies behind the use of the term *janapada.* This relation which existed between the *janapada* and the people is abundantly seen below in the passage in the *Dīgha Nikāya,* where the brāhmaṇa chaplain of the legendary king Mahāvijita counsels the king on doing

good to people.[163]

> The king's *janapada* is harassed and oppressed. The *gāmas*, *nigamas* and *nagaras* are being destroyed.[164] Roads are unsafe. So long as the *janapada* is in this state, it is most unwise to levy fresh taxes. Even if the king manages to stop the rogues' game by degradation, banishment and fines, and by putting some to death, their mischief cannot be satisfactorily put a stop to. The remnant left unpunished would still go on harassing the *janapada*. The king should supply the farmers and cattle keepers with seeds and fodder, should give capital to the trader and pay wages and food to the employees in his service. Then these men, following each his own business, will no longer harass the *janapada*; the king's revenue will go up, the *janapada* will be quiet and at peace; and the people pleased with one another and happy, dancing their children in their arms, will dwell with open doors.

This is an idealized picture of a happy *janapada*. The term here is again used as a socio-economic unit in which the prosperity of the *janapada* depended on the economic welfare of the people. The usual components of the *janapada*, *gāma*, *nigama* and *nagara*, are also present.

Sometimes *janapada* denoted an undefined and extensive region. We find a great caravan of a thousand carts going from the eastern region (*puratthimā janapada*) into the western region (*pacchimaṃ janapadaṃ*). While passing through the jungle, the leader of the caravan encounters a *yakkha* in the guise of a traveller. The leader asks him, "From where do you come?" He replies, "From such and such a *janapada*." "Where are you going?" asks the *yakkha*. "To such and such a *janapada*," replies the leader.[165] In the conversation between the caravan leader and the *yakkha*, the names of the *janapada* are not given, as this simile was meant to be a point of general illustration. But obviously both of them must have known the broad divisions of the region, and what they would be interested in asking each other would be the exact names of the *janapada*. Thus a two-fold meaning of *janapada* is apparent here. In the first

part of the story it means a very wide and vague region, while in the conversation it implies a smaller specified one. In the second instance, a trustworthy informer of a king may tell him of a *janapada*, rich, full of gold, women, food etc., and which may be situated to the east, west, north or south or even overseas (*pārasamuddo*). The king would like to "conquer and subjugate that *janapada* (*abhivijaya ajjhāvaseyyāma*)."[166]

On account of regional variations in social habits, the Buddha is said to have relaxed some of the rules which he had established for the monks in the *Majjhima janapada* and which were difficult to apply in other regions. The peculiarities of the region *Avantidakkhiṇāpatha* are noticed by the monk Mahākaccāna, himself a resident of Avanti. He even suggests the changes the Buddha should introduce in his *Vinaya* laws for that region. The following are his arguments: (1) In the *Avanatidakkhiṇ-āpatha,* the surface-soil is dark, hard, trampled by the hooves of cattle, and the Buddha should allow sandals with many linings in this region. (2) Since people there attach importance to bathing and to purification by water, the Buddha should allow constant bathing. (3) In the *Avantidakkhiṇāpatha*, coverings of sheep-hide, goat-hide and deer-hide are used, whereas in the *Majjhima janapada* coverings of *eragu*, *moragu* , *majjhāru* and *jantu* are used. The Buddha should allow hide covering. (4) The other changes deal with the *Vinaya* procedure which are not important at this juncture. The Buddha concedes these requests of the monk Mahā-kaccāna.[167]

Admittedly, the term *Majjhima janapada* has been used by the monk in the sense of an extensive region. This looseness in the application of the term is to be seen in the passage when the *Vinaya* writers try to define the extent and the limits of the *Majjhima janapada.* The only way they could do so was by pointing out what seem to be the rough sign posts which demarcated the boundary lines of the *Majjhima janapada.* The boundaries of the *Majjhima janapada* are described as follows:

> Kajaṅgala *nigama* is in the eastern direction, beyond it is Mahāsālā, further than that are outlying regions (*paccantimā janapadā*), on this side are the middle

> (*orato majjhe*). The river Sallavatī is in the south-eastern direction further.... Setakaṇṇika *nigama* is in the southern direction further ....Thūṇa the brāhmaṇa *gāma* is in the western direction ....The mountain slopes called Usiraddhaja is in the northern direction further...[168]

The definition carries the implication that *Majjhima janapada* was a more or less culturally homogeneous region *vis-a-vis* the others. *Majjhima janapada* is contrasted with outlying regions (*pacchantimā janapadā* which apparently included the region known as *Avantidakkhiṇāpatha).*[169] The customs of different regions are noted, only to be criticised or commented upon. Thus we are told that in the *dakkhiṇa janapada*, they have a ceremony called *dhovana* celebrated by feasting, dancing and singing. Buddha, however, calls this custom of *dhovana* unaryan, vulgar and not conducive to the attainment of *nibbāṇa.*[170] In another instance the Buddha refers to an ancient custom in a certain *janapada* where people throw dust, cow dung and ashes on newly wed girls without, however, knowing the import of such an action.[171] By way of illustration the ignorance of the people of outlying regions (*paccantimā janapadā*) is brought forward thus:[172]

> A conch blower (*saṅkha dhamo*), once goes to the outlying *janapada.* Early in the morning he goes to the *gāma* of that *janapada* and blows his conch. The people of that *gāma* apparently have never heard this instrument being played before, and when they listen to it they are charmed. They all gather and go to the conch blower who, in the meantime, has placed the instrument down and is sitting on the ground. The people experiment with the instrument, hoping that it will blow of its own accord, without realizing the fact that it is the blower who is responsible for creating the music. "How silly are these people born in the outlying *janapada*," remarks the conch blower, and while they look on, he takes his conch, blows it thrice and goes away.

This broad regional difference is manifested in the field

of social interaction. In the *Majjhima Nikāya*, the brāhmaṇa Assalāyana advocates the claims to superiority made by the brāhmaṇas as regards their birth and status. Denying this claim, the Buddha tells Assalāyana how in Yona and Kamboja and other outlying regions there are two *vaṇṇas*, the master and the slave, and that it is possible for a master to become a slave or for a slave to become a master.[173]

The unity of a region is expressed in terms of the stubbornness of its people in keeping to their regional dialects. Thus the Buddha admonishes the monks saying that one should not deviate from the common dialect of the region. In different *janapadas* they know different words for a bowl. They call it *pati*, *patta*, *vittha*, *sarāva*, *dhāropa*, *poṇa* and *pisāla*. A person knowing only one of these words will imagine that this only is right and all others are wrong.[174]

We see this spirit of preservation of the unity of the *janapada* projected elsewhere, and sometimes the differences in the nearby region within a broader cultural area are indicated and these are worthy of consideration. At Devadaha, a *nigama* of the Sākyas, many *bhikkhus* bound for the western land approach the Buddha and express their intention to go west (*pacchābhūmaṃ janapadaṃ*) and make their residence there.[175] The Buddha asks them to consult Sāriputta over this matter. Sāriputta advises them saying, "Now friends, there are people who question a *bhikkhu* who goes from one place to another (*nāvāverajjagataṃ*). Wise men may enquire of what doctrine does your teacher declare? What does he announce?" He then gives them a discourse on the Buddha's doctrine. That the *bhikkhus* were liable to questioning by others about their teacher and the particular creed which they professed makes it clear that the western region was new to some of them and they had to face unforeseen difficulties. *Pacchābhūmaka janapada* seems to have been used in a very general way to mean any place lying west of Sākyan territory. Similarly we find *paccābhūmaka* brāhmaṇas in Nālandā.[176] Whatever may be the origin of these *pacchābhūmaka* brāhmaṇas, they are considered different from the indigenous people of Nālandā. In modern India, especially in the north, the

difference of "east" and "west" is fairly common. A person living on the upper Gangā above Prayāga will call a person living across the river, a man coming from the west and in doing so he will claim superior cultural traits. Of course, this feeling is usually reciprocal.

We have shown that the *janapada* is a loosely used term which denotes a territory or a region. The term *jana* is used in the sense of individuals or a group of individuals (*bahujana*), whereas *janapada* refers, among its other varied uses, to a people (in fact, the term *jānapada* means the people of a *janapada*), that is, in our period to an extended kin-group or a socio-cultural group, presumably with a territory of their own, though not exclusively held by them. Thus any geographical area may comprise the territories of the two *janapadas* interspersed. Such a situation is often to be found even in modern times, where the same geographical areas may be occupied by more than one tribe, all of them distinct social entities and having cultural contacts with each other. The relationships of these extended kin-groups will be more clearly understood after further examination of the data.

Janapada and Extended Kin-groups

In discussing various groups in relation to the *janapada*, we shall use the term "extended kin-group" for them in preference to other terms like "tribe" or "clan," which have been generally used hitherto. At this stage we may also clarify certain notions regarding tribal and caste society. As today, no doubt, tribes existed in this period. By tribal organisation we mean a society which is on the whole not based on occupational division. Caste society, on the contrary, is based on occupational division, though a society based on extended kin-group need not necessarily develop all the features of caste. As we intend to show, the society of these books is not tribal, but is one in which an extensive division of labour has taken place, including the growth of trade.[177] Hence in describing kinship and allied features of this society we would prefer not to use terms like "clan," as they are often used in conjunction with tribal organisation. In their place we shall use the following

terms: Family, extended family, lineage, kin-group, and extended kin-group.

Extended kin-groups, for our purposes, may have legendary or real common descent, a name and a common social structure peculiar to them, encompassing a definite group of people, common customs, folkways, mythology etc., and a common territory. The individual identifies himself with the group, while the group as a whole juxtaposes itself against other such groups within the larger social structure. As pointed out already, the same territory may contain two coexisting groups who maintain their separate identity by emphasizing their internal differences, though they have much in common otherwise. This will be made clear in the following pages.

We will first consider the sixteen *mahājanapadas* which are as follows: Aṅga, Magadha, Kāsi, Kosala,Vajji, Malla, Ceti, Vaṃsa, Kuru, Pañcāla, Maccha, Surasena, Assaka, Avanti, Gandhāra and Kamboja.[178] This list has been interpreted by scholars as indicating the political subdivisions of Buddhist India.[179] But this is of minor significance to the present study, where the significance of the *janapada* as socio-cultural regions is more important. Also this emphasis on the interpretation of *janapadas* as political entities has led to much confusion resulting from stretching the term's meaning to convey a wide range of political implications. We are inclined to believe that a socio-cultural interpretation of the word is more in accordance with the ideas of its original users. Rhys Davids feels that the main idea in the minds of those who drew up or used the above list was still "tribal and not geographical."[180] If this was so, it is difficult to explain the absence of the several important groups, such as Sākyas, Licchavis, Kālāmas and Koliyas who were distinct social entities and who had separate territories of their own. The list of the sixteen *janapadas* most probably refers to broad geographical divisions, each occupied by one or more extended kin group. In this respect the order in which the sixteen are mentioned is noteworthy.

In the *Janavasabha Sutta*[181] of the *Dīgha Nikāya*, the Buddha spoke of the rebirths of his followers who had died in the *janapada* round about,[182] mentioning the regions of

Kāsi-Kosala, Vajji-Mallas, Ceti-Vaṃsa, Kuru-Pāñcāla and Maccha-Surasenā. But he did not mention those followers living in Aṅga-Magadha. Ānanda realized that there were also Magadhan followers (*Māgadhaka paricārakā*) who had died with profound faith in the Buddha's doctrine, and he thought, "One might think Aṅga-Magadha devoid of Magadhan followers."[183] Two things appear from this passage: firstly, the regions are mentioned in pairs, and, secondly, Aṅga-Magadha denotes one territory and the Magadhans are here mentioned as belonging to the Aṅga-Magadha territory. In another case, at the time of the great sacrifice of Uruvela Kassapa, the *Jaṭila*, a vast concourse of Aṅgas and Magadhas wished to attend it with plentiful provisions of food. Kassapa knew this and thought, "My great sacrifice is at hand and a vast concourse of Aṅgas and Magadhas wish to attend it; if on that occasion the Buddha should perform a marvel of power before the people (*mahājanakāya*) his gain and honour would increase."[184] The two territories are thus considered as one region and the people of these are proposing to engage themselves in common religious activity. In the light of this and the other passage mentioned above, the pairing of *janapadas* seems to have existed in the minds of the authors.

We may now consider some of the *janapadas* mentioned in the texts, including some of those referred to in the list of sixteen *mahājanapadas*. As a choice has to be made in the selection of the *janapadas* for treatment, we shall mention only those of which we have sufficient knowledge and which furnish us with further evidence of the characteristics of a *janapada*.

Magadha[185]

We are inclined to believe that nowhere in the texts does the word Magadha specifically refer to an extended kin-group, although it may have been so used in the early Vedic period.[186] The implication of its being a territory seems clear in the text. Thus in the *Vinaya Mahāvagga*, the king of Magadha, Bimbisāra, together with a vast number of brāhmaṇas and *gahapatis* of Magadha, goes to see the Buddha, who had at that time recently arrived at

Rājagaha.[187] Many distinguished sons of the families of Magadha (*Magadhikā kulaputta*) led a holy life with the Buddha. Because of this, the people (*manussā*) become angry and disturbed and accuse the Buddha of breaking of the family (*kulapacchedāya*).[188]

It is the stock phrase at many places that so and so was journeying among the Magadhas (*Magadhesu*) and this apparently suggests only that he was staying or journeying in the territory of Magadha. Thus in references to the Buddha's places of residence in Magadha, specific details of their location are often given together with the general location "among the Magadhas (*Magadhesu*)," which seems here evidently to be thought of purely geographically.[189] The expression of the name of regions and districts in the plural may also be found in Indian literature of much later date.

Magadha, with its capital Rājagaha, and kings Bimbisāra and Ajātasattu, sometimes was known as a *mahājanapada.*[190] The same was the case with Aṅga. But in some passages Magadha and Aṅga taken together seem to comprise a single *mahājanapada.*

Aṅga [191]

We find the Buddha traversing the territory of Aṅga which was politically affiliated with Magadha. Two *nigamas* of Aṅga are mentioned, Assapura[192] and Āpaṇa.[193] Āpaṇa is mentioned twice; in the first instance it is stated simply to belong to the territory of Aṅga, while in the next it seems that the texts more accurately mention it as in the territory north of Aṅga (*Aṅguttarapesu*).[194] The capital of Aṅga was Campā and the residents of this city were known as *Cāmpeyyakas.*[195] A Bhaddiya *nagara* is mentioned, which seems to lie in between the territory of Aṅga and Magadha. Bimbisāra once referred to it as being in the "land conquered by us (*vijite*)."[196] However, there seems to be no indication as to whether it belonged to the territory of Magadha or Aṅga, as the name of this *nagara* occurs without the usual Pāli prefixes, such as *Aṅgesu* and *Magadhesu.* It seems most likely that the area occupied by that *nagara* was common both to Aṅgas and Magadhas, a

cross-cultural zone brought about by the intermingling of the people of two distinct geographical areas; that presumably is the reason for the disconnection of the words suggesting the geographical entities.

Kosala [197]

We find much more information about this *janapada* than any other. Sāvatthi, the capital of Kosala, was the centre of activity of Buddhism. Woodward calculated all the references of Sāvatthi in the four *Nikāyas*, and he states that 871 *suttas* are said to have been preached in Sāvatthi, of which 844 were delivered in the Jetavana, 23 in the Pubbārāma, and four in the suburbs. These *suttas* are made of six in the *Dīgha*, 75 in the *Majjhima*, 736 in the *Saṃyutta* and 54 in the *Aṅguttara.*[198] This clearly shows the familiarity with which the authors of the texts viewed Sāvatthi and its surrounding regions. The king Pasenadi of Kosala was more widely known than his contemporary kings, Bimbisāra, Ajātasattu, Pajjota and Udena. The whole of the third *Saṃyutta,* consisting of 25 anecdotes, each with a moral bias, is devoted to the king of Kosala, and there are about an equal number of references to him in other parts of the literature.[199] In contrast, there are in the first four *Nikāyas* only six *suttas* which mention the Magadhan king Bimbisāra, and Vidūḍabha of the commentaries is barely mentioned in the *Nikāyas.* [200] The king of the Vacchas, Rājā Udena is mentioned twice[201] and so also is king Pajjota of Avanti.[202] This again testifies to the fact that Kosala, with its capital and king, were favourite topics among the Buddhist writers.

In spite of this familiarity with the Kosalan region, the word Kosala does not seem to refer to a specific extended kin-group. The Kosala region abounded in brāhmaṇa *gāmas* alongside which were few *nigamas.* We have mentioned earlier the Kosalan brāhmaṇa *gāmas.*[203] Among the *nigamas* mentioned are: Daṇḍakappa, Caṇḍakappa, Pakudha and Nāḷakapāna.[204] Sāketa, which was regarded as one of the six great cities of India, the others being Campā, Rājagaha, Sāvatthi, Kosāmbi and Banaras, was in the Kosala. King Pasenadi used to visit this city, which

was a day's journey from Sāvatthi, and which seems to have been his second capital.[205] Ayojjhā, another Kosalan city, is mentioned only once.[206]

Kosala and Sākyas

It is noteworthy that we find in the Kosala *janapada* the *nigamas* and the *nagara* of the Sākyas. In the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, the Buddha while journeying in the Kosala region came to Kapilavatthu the capital of the Sākyas.[207] The other instance tells us about the Buddha's stay in Kapilavatthu.[208] In the first instance the Buddha is journeying (*cārikaṃ caramāno*), not staying (*viharati*), in the Kosala region. Thus only a geographical sense of the word is implied, in that it gives a notion of a broad regional division. "Staying" in, however, implies a temporary residence there. In this context, therefore, although the territory occupied by the Sākyas came under the broad classificatory region known as Kosala, this difference in presentation of the words seems to bring out the vagueness of the term.

In the *Sutta Nipāta*, the Buddha tells of his Sākyan origin to King Bimbisāra of Magadha in his capital Rājagaha.[209] It appears from the passage that Bimbisāra probably knew Kosala region, but was, perhaps, unaware of the independent existence of the Sākyans. The Buddha says to the king:"There is a people dwelling just by the side of the Himalayas, in the Kosala region (*Kosalesu*), endowed with wealth and power. Their *gotta* is Adicca and they are known as Sākyans by birth (*jātiya*). From that group (*kula*) I have accepted monkhood, forsaking all sensual pleasures." The general way by which the term Kosala is used here to help to establish the identity of the Buddha and his extended kin-group is noteworthy. In the *Majjhima*, the Buddha stayed in the territory of the Sākyas in the *nigama* of the Sākyans called Meḍaḷumpa.[210] Pasenadi, the king of Kosala, met him there. Pasenadi gave many reasons why he showed signs of respect and affection to the Buddha, one being that the Buddha like himself was a *khattiya* and a Kosalan. It is most likely that the Kosala king is referring to Kosala in the sense of its being a broad

regional entity to which the Buddha and he, himself, belonged. The use of the word *khattiya* is also significant here, for *khattiya* is also a general term, a conceptual grouping wherein all the ruling groups could be accommodated without their loosing identity. Presumably, in the same broad sense the Kosalan region was understood and used, and it does not necessarily allude to the political dominance of the Kosala King.

From the above passages it seems clear that the Sākyans were distinctly identified as an extended kin-group. Their *nagara* Kapilavatthu is always mentioned along with their group's name. We also find references to their *nigamas* such as Naṅgaraka, Meḍaḷumpa, Devadaha, Khomadussa etc.[211] All these *nigamas* are specified as belonging to the Sākayans (*Sakkānaṃ*) and also being in the territory of Sākyans (*Sakkesu*). But unlike the Kosala and Aṅga *nigamas* that are also mentioned similarly in the text, these *niagamas* seem to allude to the Sākyan dominance in these *nigamas*.

Malla

The region known as Malla, which is included in the list of *mahājanapadas*, was situated to the east and south-east of the territory of the Sākyans.[212] An extensive belt of the Himālayan forest, Mahāvana, covered some portions of Vajji and Malla territory. The Mallas as people are at some places addressed as *Vāseṭṭhas*, their *gotta* name.[213] Malalasekera wrongly thought that the Licchavis were also referred to by this *gotta*.[214] Later on, however, both the Mallas and the Licchavis are classified as *vrātya kṣatriya*.[215] Kosambi maintains that they were described as mixed castes by Manu because they did not follow brāhmaṇic rituals and this is proved by their not performing Vedic sacrifice.[216] Nevertheless, we have indications that the brāhmaṇas were active in this region in the Buddha's time. The funeral rites of the Buddha performed by the Mallan chiefs suggest the brāhmaṇic ritual described in the *Kalpa Sutra* literature.[217] The fact that the Mallas were called *Vāseṭṭhas* may prove the increasing influence of the brāhmaṇas over this group. Manu seems to

treat these extended kin-groups as castes, which suggests that, in course of time, these extended kin-groups were slowly ossified into castes. It is quite likely that the leading members of the Licchavis and Mallas in the time of the composition of the *Manusmṛti* were the followers of non-brāhmaṇic sects and had perhaps forsaken the brāhmaṇic rituals. Hence, though they were already under the influence of the brāhamaṇas at the time of the Buddha, they had become *vrātyas* some centuries later, when Manu was composed.[218] The evidence of the latter period is not necessarily true of the former. We find the Mallas in two centres, at Pāvā and Kusināra. Pāvā is specified as a *nagara* of the Mallas (*Pāvā nāma mallānaṃ nagaraṃ*),[219] whereas Kusināra is mentioned without such specification.[220] We do not know about the relationships of these two groups, whether they belonged to the same stock of the Mallas or not. In this context the remarks made by the Mallas of Pāvā when claiming the relics of the Buddha, are worthy of notice. They claimed them on the ground that they were *khattiyas* and the Buddha was a *khattiya*. The Kusināra Mallas claimed them on the ground that the Buddha died on their land (*gāma khetta*).[221] Thus while claiming the relics, the Mallas of Pāvā do not seem to make use of any ties, kinship or otherwise, with the Mallas of Kusināra.

Vajji

It has been maintained that the Vajjis included eight confederate clans of which the Licchavis and the Videhans were the most powerful.[222] The relation of the Videhans to the Licchavis or the Vajjis is not stated in the *Vinaya* or the first four *Nikāyas*. We have the stock phrase "journeyed in the territory of Videhans" (*Videhesu*) mentioned twice in the text, and both times it is mentioned in connection with its capital Mithilā, which was about 35 miles north-west from Vesāli.[223] Indeed, it is difficult to establish the membership of the Videhans in the Vajjian confederacy at the time of the Buddha. The word confederacy implies a political league and in that sense we cannot be sure of the relation of the Vajjis with any other ruling extended

kin-groups, as there is no direct or indirect proof of it in the text.

The territorial implication of the term Vajji is less vulnerable to doubts. It has been mentioned as *mahājanapada* along with the land of the Mallas. The land of the Vajjis thus represented an area inhabited perhaps by an association of extended kin-groups. It may be conjectured that the Videhans were taken as Vajjis in the sense that they belonged to the same region. The identity of the Licchavis and the Vajjis is, however, clear in the text. In fact, the words seem to have been used as synonyms. Thus in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, many Licchavis come to the Buddha, who speaks to them thus:"I will teach you Licchavis, seven conditions securing welfare (*dhammas*)." The Buddha concludes by saying,"As these shall endure among the Vajjians, and the Vajjians shall be instructed in them, the prosperity of the Vajjians should be expected and not the decline."[224] In the next discourse the brāhmaṇa Vassakāra, the Magadhan minister, comes to the Buddha at the command of the King Ajātasattu to ask him about the means of destroying the Vajjis.[225] In yet, another place, the Buddha instructs Vassakāra saying, "At one time I stayed at Vesāli at the Sarananada shrine; there I taught the Vajjians the seven conditions securing welfare."[226]

There is, however, a certain confusion in the minds of scholars concerning the term Vajji. B.C. Law thinks that it connotes a confederacy as well as a separate constituent clan of that confederacy and that "the confederacy is also associated with the name of Licchavis forming another constituent clan."[227] Law, thus seems to consider Vajjis and Licchavis as two different constituent clans. But at another place he contradicts his own statement by mentioning "the Vajjis or Licchavis as possessing bright complexion."[228] We have pointed out above that Licchavis are called Vajjians in the text, but that other extended kin-groups probably associated with them were incorporated in the Vajjian territory. This seems to be borne out by yet another passage. Young Licchavis who have been out hunting become meek and subdued and pay homage to the Buddha. Mahānāma the Licchavi on seeing this exclaims, "They will become Vajjis (*bhavissanti Vajji*)."[229] Hare interprets

this remark to show the cultural superiority of the Vajjis over the Licchavis, and presupposes the separate existence of the Vajjis as an ethnic entity for which we do not seem to have any adequate proof.[230] The more appropriate explanation seems to be that offered by Malalasekera, when he points out that there was a prospect of these young men becoming true Vajjians practising the seven conditions of welfare taught by the Buddha which ensured their prosperity.[231] This is supported by the fact that these Licchavi youths were deprecated by Mahānāma for being greedy, ill-tempered and rough hooligans. He was naturally pleased to see them acting so meekly before the Buddha.[232] We do not find reference to a separate territory of the Licchavis. Among their *gāmas* were, Hat-thigāma, Ambugāma, Bhaṇḍagāma,[233] and Koṭigāma[234] and all these are mentioned as belonging to the territory of the Vajjis (*vajjīsu*).

Two place-names, Ñātika and Bhoganagara, are referred to individually without any reference to Vajjian territory, although these are at times mentioned in connection with the other Vajji *gāmas*. Thus in the *Vinaya Mahāvagga*,[235] we read that the Buddha, after staying for some time at Koṭigāma went to Ñātikas. There he lodged in the *ñātika's* brick hall. The term *ñātika* in all probability refers to an extended kingroup to which Mahāvira the Jain belonged.[236] In the *Mahāparinibbāṇa Sutta*, a Bhoganagara is mentioned last in the list of place names, after Bhaṇḍagāma, Hatthigāma and Ambugāma.[237] This order describes the Buddha's route between Vesāli and the Mallan country. Bhoganagara was perhaps common *nagara* belonging both to the Vajjis and the Mallas.

Miscellaneous Ruling Extended Kin-groups

In the *Dīgha Nikāya*, the following extended kin-groups among others, are mentioned: (1)The Bullis of Allakappa,(2) the Koḷiyas of Rāmagāma,(3) the Moriyas of Pipphalivana,(4) the Bhaggas of Sumsimara, and (5) the Kālāmas of Kesaputta.[238] Besides the occasional reference to the Koḷiyas and Kālāmas, we have little or no knowledge of these groups. B.C. Law who considers them as tribes

says, "They are mere passing shadows in the early Buddhist records, there being scarcely any data for an historical account." We may not agree with Law's use of the term "tribe" to designate these extended kin-groups, but his observations seem to be accurate.[239]

Chapter III
Social Groups and Ranking

Introduction

IN this chapter we consider the interpersonal relationships found in the texts in which the personality of the Buddha figures so prominently. They are to be found in the descriptions of instances of actual behaviour between various persons. These descriptions, among other things, consist of a limited number of phrases and terms which recur in a large number of instances. We shall refer to these as "formalisations." We are concerned with the three main categories of formalisations, which in more general terms we define as groups, found in the texts, viz.: forms of salutation described by the writers of the texts, the terms of address used by the persons involved and the terms of reference used for the persons involved. A particular formalisation may cover a different set of persons each time it occurs.

In each instance of inter-personal relationship the persons occupy two separate roles. A number of such roles, in which the same formalisations occur, taken together may indicate that all the persons involved fall into two inter-acting groups. The formalisation may in such an instance be taken to indicate the group affiliation of the persons involved. In the case of each formalisation there may be more than one set of opposing groups.

The formalisation, however, also indicates the specific nature of the relationship existing between the persons involved. Such a relationship may be characterised as either that between equals or that between an inferior and superior. The status of each person (and the group) *vis-a-vis* the other may be inferred from the actual words which comprise the formalisation.

We argue at this stage that from a study of formalisations, it is possible to discern a number of groups existing

within those in social contact with the Buddha and his disciples. Furthermore, it is possible to order not only the opposing groups referring to a single formalisation but all the groups formed through formalisations into a general system of ranking. This is what we attempt in this chapter.

We have dealt with the formalisations in two ways. On the one hand we have collected a number of instances where the persons involved fall into two distinct groups and wherein a single set of formalisations occur. Through this we indicate the existence of various groups. It must be noted that the cases are illustrative of the group and may not contain all the instances of a group. On the other hand we have taken actual instances which significantly establish the nature of the relationship between the persons (and through them the groups) involved. It may be pointed out that in the second type of treatment we have assumed that the persons are representative of the groups to which they are affiliated. We have also dealt with those specific instances where the formalisations obtained do not conform to the group affiliation earlier indicated and hence need further explanation.

Coming to the actual material, we find it convenient to take the Buddha as one of the parties in each of the instances we examine. The advantages of such a practise are obvious. The Buddha is a central figure in the text in more ways than one. Every person or group finds his distance from the Buddha through the terms of address which the Buddha uses for him and which he uses for the Buddha, the way in which he greets the Buddha and is in turn greeted and that in which he refers to the Buddha and is himself referred to. The Buddha, in our analysis which follows, is at the centre of the social order. The social distances are measured in each case with reference to the Buddha and vary in each case. The degree of social distance varies with the group, and through the formalisation of their mode of address the groups themselves find their relationship with the Buddha.

Simultaneously, we also examine the relationship of the groups *vis-a-vis* each other, through formalisations but without the intermediacy of the Buddha, whenever this is possible. Hence we may obtain a picture of the *de facto*

social stratification of Indian society, as it appeared to the authors and compilers of the Pāli canon.

The Buddha and the brāhmaṇas

The commonest mode of address used by the brāhmaṇas while addressing their equals is *bho.*[1] In addressing the Buddha they invariably use the term *bho Gotama.*[2] The term *bho Gotama* denies special status to the Buddha in that *bho*, which is a term used among the brāhmaṇas when addressing each other, denotes equality, whereas *Gotama* refers to the Buddha's *gotta* affiliation and not to his unique personalty.

The exception to the rule, however, occurs when a brāhmaṇa addresses the Buddha in anger. A case in point is that of Asurindaka Bhāradvāja brāhmaṇa who when angry addresses the Buddha as *samaṇa.*[3] Another such case is that of Paccanīka brāhmaṇa who deliberately insults the Buddha by calling him *samaṇa.*[4] Another exception is in the case of the brāhmaṇa Udaya. Buddha goes to the brāhmaṇa Udaya's house and begs for alms. The brāhmaṇa fills the Buddha's bowl with rice. The Buddha repeats it the next day. After he has done so the third time, Udaya says to the Buddha, "A pertinacious man is the *samaṇa Gotama* that he comes again and again." [5]

Only in one instance does the brāhmaṇa resort to the use of *bhante* to address the Buddha. A certain brāhmaṇa invites the Buddha to a meal in competition with others, thereby showing his obvious leaning towards the Buddha. In his formal invitation to the Buddha he addresses him as *bhante* along with *bho Gotama.*[6] By addressing the Buddha as *bhante* the brāhmaṇa manifests his deep respect towards him; the additional *bho Gotama* indicates his retention of the membership of the brāhmaṇa group.

In another exceptional case, the brāhmaṇa Piṅgayāni comes forward before the assembly of the Licchavis and addresses the Buddha as *Bhagavā* and Sugata.[7] He utters an impromptu couplet in which he praises and compares the Buddha with the Aṅgirasa, the sun. The Licchavis, however, reward him for this act by presenting him with 500 robes, which the brāhmaṇa gives to the Buddha.

The Buddha is referred to by the brāhmaṇas as *samaṇo*

Gotama. The usual description of the salutation the brāhmaṇas use for the Buddha is *saddhiṃ sammodi* (henceforth abbreviated as *s.s.*), indicating an exchange of greetings, and once again implying equality of status, whereas the behaviour of other classes towards the Buddha, as we shall show presently, is described through the term *abhivādeti*, indicating respectful salutation. Like everyone else, the brāhmaṇa also sits and talks to the Buddha. However, in angry or insulting mood he does not do so. Thus, the brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha was sent on an errand by his teacher Pokkharasādi to confirm the 32 marks which were on the Buddha's body. Ambaṭṭha, along with other young brāhmaṇa, enters the Buddha's chamber. They exchange greetings (*s.s.*), but while others sit down, Ambaṭṭha, walking about, says something polite in an offhand way. He stands and fidgets all the while, even though the Buddha is seated. [8] When the Buddha points out his lack of respect for his elders, he replies that he reserves his good manners only for brāhmaṇas. In another case, the brāhmaṇa Mānatthadha, being hot-headed, keeps quiet instead of exchanging greetings (*s.s.*) with the Buddha.[9]

The brāhmaṇa's behaviour changes, however, when he becomes an *upāsaka.* The case of the brāhmaṇa Soṇadaṇḍa illustrates this. After becoming an *upāsaka*, Soṇadaṇḍa invites the Buddha for a meal. After the meal he proposes a form of behaviour alternative to the one customary for an *upāsaka.* He would join hands in salutation on entering the assembly only symbolically, by stretching forth his joined palms, and bow down low in salutation also symbolically, only by waving his hands whilst leaving.[10] Usually *upāsakas*, whether householders, monks, or kings salute (*abhivādeti*) the Buddha, and, keeping their right side to his, circumambulate and take leave of him. This is the stereotyped description found in the text. In the case of Soṇadaṇḍa, the brāhmaṇa acts less respectfully for fear of loss of status.

The behaviour of the brāhmaṇa Brahmāyu is different.[11] Like others of his group, he also initially exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) and addresses the Buddha as *bho Gotama.* But, after seeing the 32 bodily signs on the Buddha's body and listening to the *dhamma*, unlike other brāhmaṇas he falls

at the feet of the Buddha, strokes and kisses his feet and pronounces his name.[12] This is a most unusual spectacle to the onlooking brāhmaṇas. They are awestruck and say, "Indeed, it is wonderful, indeed it is marvellous how great is the psychic power and the majesty of the recluse in virtue of which the brāhmaṇa Brahmāyu, well known and renowned, pays such deep respect."

Such behaviour by a brāhmaṇa is extremely rare and one suspects the missionary bias of the Buddhist writers in describing the scene. In any case the account clearly implies that for a brāhmaṇa to pay such respect to a non-brāhmaṇa was looked on as very unusual.

The practise in the case of those who become *arahats*, or enter the Buddhist *saṃgha* is very different, even when the converts are brāhmaṇas. Thus Sela brāhmaṇa who joins the order and becomes an *arahat*, thenceforth addresses the Buddha as *bhante Bhagavā*.[13] We also notice a change in terms of reference in the text. The prefix *āyasmā* is added to these brāhmaṇas who become monks.

The Buddha-brāhmaṇa relationship, in terms of mode of address and salutation, is characterised by four stages of social distance. Farthest from the Buddha are those hostile brāhmaṇas who address him as *samaṇa*. Those favourably inclined address him as *bho Gotama*, but do so only through fear of the loss of status within the brāhmaṇic order. An *upāsaka* does not relinquish his former status on becoming a Buddhist. The nearest to the Buddha are the monks and *arahats* who have renounced not only their faith in brāhmaṇic teaching but also their membership of the brāhmaṇic order. Buddha, on the other hand, in addressing brāhmaṇas, uses a number of terms which normally include the title brāhmaṇa. Some times in familiar cases he also addresses particular brāhmaṇas by referring to their *gotta*. Brāhmaṇa-*gahapatis* when in a group are addressed by him as *gahapatayo*, stressing their role as heads of households. The brāhmaṇa youths, however, he addresses by their personal names as *māṇava* (student).

When a brāhmaṇa becomes a Buddhist monk, he is addressed by the Buddha with his *gotta* and never as brāhmaṇa. In the terms of reference the personal name and *gotta* are used. In addition, the usual forms of address and the

titles used in addressing monks, such as *āvuso* and *āyasmā* respectively, also occur.

The Buddha and the Jains

Very few Jains are actually mentioned in the text although their doctrine was known to the Buddha.[14] A *Niganṭhaputta* Saccaka has talks with the Buddha among others, in which he addresses the Buddha as *bho Gotama.* The Buddha, however, addresses Saccaka by his *gotta,* Aggivessana. Saccaka's mode of address is coupled with the usual exchange of greetings (*s.s.*).[15] It is interesting to note Prince Abhaya's behaviour towards the Buddha and Niganṭha Nāṭaputta.[16] He salutes (*abhivādeti*) the Niganṭha Nāṭaputta, sits down, and addresses him as *bhante.* Winding up the conversation he salutes him, circumambulates him and goes to the Buddha. He repeats the whole procedure when he approaches and takes leave of the Buddha. Both the Buddha and the Nāṭaputta address him as *rājakumāra.*[17] The activities of the prince Abhaya mentioned above suggests that he gave equal respect to these two religious heads.

The Buddha and the Paribbājakas

The type of recluses mentioned as *paribbājakas* can be grouped into three categories according to their attitude towards the Buddha: (1) those who consider the Buddha as their equal, (2) those who do so at first but in the end are converted, thereby bringing about an essential change in their attitude towards the Buddha, and (3) those who have already acknowledged him as their superior.

Generally the Buddha is addressed as *bho Gotama*; he in his turn uses either the personal names or the *gotta* names of the *paribbājakas.* The latter is illustrated by the case of Dīghanakha the *paribbājaka.*[18] The name Dīghanakha,"long nails," is obviously a soubriquet, but the Buddha adresses him by his *gotta*, Aggivessana.

Bho followed by *Gotama* seems to have a formal bearing on the social relationships of the *paribbājakas* and the Buddha. Its use indicates that the *paribbājakas* thought that they were of a status at least equal to but separate from that of the Buddha. The Buddha, however, does not show

equal respect, and in many cases addresses them by their names without the title *bho*. It is also of great significance to note the exchange of greetings (*s.s.*) which is usually followed by the familiar *bho*, in the Buddha-*paribbājaka* relationship.

In angry mood the *paribbājakas* change their mode of address from *bho Gotama* to *samaṇa Gotama*. Thus the *paribbājaka* Vekhanassa addresses the Buddha as *bho Gotama*, and exchanges greetings with him.[19] However, during the conversation with the Buddha, the Buddha tells him that it is hard to understand "sense pleasure or the happiness in sense pleasure or the topmost happiness in sense pleasure" as the latter is not an *arahat*. The *paribbājaka* does not like this remark. He becomes angry and displeased, "scorning even the Buddha, despising even him, saying the *samaṇa Gotama* shall be disgraced."[20]

Our second type of relationship in which the *paribbājaka* ultimately acknowledges the Buddha's greatness, is well illustrated by an example from the *Majjhima Nikāya*.[21] Vacchagotta the *paribbājaka* at first, when he approaches the Buddha, exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) with him and addresses him as *bho Gotama*. Convinced of Buddha's doctrine, after his discourse, we find the *paribbājaka* Vacchagotta asking the Buddha for ordination. When he is ordained, Vacchagotta addresses the Buddha as *bhante, Bhagavā*. The transformation from *bho* to *bhante* thus shows the change in relationship, from mutual respect to the admission of the Buddha's superiority. In this particular instance the change in the term of address follows the change in the relative status of a man, here implied by the entry of Vacchagotta *paribbājaka* into the Buddhist *saṃgha*. Thus Vacchagotta the *paribbājaka* becomes *āyasmā* Vacchagotta.

In the *Kassapa Sihanāda Sutta*,[22] Acela Kassapa puts out a reported allegation against the Buddha,"that he reviles and finds fault with everyone who lives a hard life." He follows the usual procedure of exchange of greetings (*s.s.*) with the Buddha followed by the familiar *bho Gotama*. The Buddha refutes the charges made against him. Apparently pleased with the Buddha's arguments, Kassapa asks him another question, but this time he addresses him as *āvuso*

Gotama. The formal ties with the Buddha expressed through *bho* are thus replaced by more relaxed and friendly terminology. His conviction of the truth of the Buddha's doctrine and his express desire to join the order are accompanied by a change in his mode of address to the Buddha who is now addressed as *bhante.*

By the use of the term *bhante Bhagavā* used in addressing the Buddha, the *paribbājakas* of the third type manifest their acknowledgement of the Buddha's superiority. The manner in which *paribbājakas* of this type receive the Buddha is formalised. The formula runs as follows: "Let *bhante Bhagavā* come, there is welcome for him, it is long since the *Bhagavā* made the opportunity to come here. *bhante Bhagavā* let him be seated on the appointed seat." Then the *paribbājakas* take a low seat and offer a high one to the Buddha. In a sense, these *paribbājakas* behave as lay converts who have changed their faith and outwardly express this by the use of the term *bhante.*

In general, *paribbājakas* assume a status equal to that of the Buddha and these few examples are deviations from their normal pattern of behaviour towards him. The following case will bring out the point clearly. The householder Pessa, the son of an elephant rider, and Kandaraka *paribbājaka* call upon the Buddha. Pessa salutes the Buddha and sits on one side(*abhivādetvā ekamantaṃ nisidi*), and afterwards addresses the Buddha as *bhante*, while on the other hand, the *paribbājaka* Kandaraka exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) and introduces the conversation with *bho Gotama*, using this form throughout. Thus we find here two distinct relationships; the first one implies, by the term *bhante*, that for Pessa the Buddha stands high in ritual ranking; the second is the relationship of equality of status.[23]

The Buddha and the Monks

Being the head of the Buddhist hierarchical system, the Buddha is always addressed as *bhante* by the monks. The monks refer to the Buddha with a special term, *Bhagavā*, which they reserve for him to the exclusion of all other human and non-human beings. They salute (*abhivādeti*) the Buddha on meeting him and usually at the end of the conversation again salute (*abhivādeti*) him, circumambulate

him, and take his leave.[24]

There is only one instance of a departure from this mode. Once the Buddha is mistaken for an ordinary monk, and the monk Pukkusāti addresses him as *āvuso.*[25] On realising the true identity of the Buddha, Pukkusāti, rising from his seat, arranging his robe over one shoulder and bowing his head to the Buddha's feet, speaks, "A transgression, *bhante,* has overcome me in that, foolish, errant and unskilled as I was, I supposed that the *Bhagavā* could be addressed as *āvuso. Bhante,* may the *Bhagavā* acknowledge my transgression for the sake of restraint in the future."[26] This incident indicates the relative importance of *bhante* and *āvuso* in speaking to a person. *Bhante* is certainly higher in terms of respect than *āvuso.*

In the *Mahāvagga,* which is considered the oldest portion of the Pāli canonical text, we observe a notable change from *āvuso* to *bhante,* in relation to the Buddha. Just after his enlightenment the Buddha goes in search of the group of five monks who are residing at Banaras.[27] These monks had previously been his followers but had left him because he was reputed to be "living in abundance." They are now sceptical of the Buddha's views and when they see him coming (referred to as *samaṇa Gotama*), they agree among themselves not to show him respect. However, they do not keep their agreement and honour the Buddha, addressing him by his *gotta* name, *Gotama* and the term *avuso.* The Buddha is a changed personality. He admonishes the monks for addressing him as *āvuso* for "he had become the Tathāgata, the holy, absolutely enlightened one."[28] He tells the monks that he wants to preach the new way of life which he had discovered through his insight. At first the *bhikkhus* (monks) pay no heed to him, and thrice they address him as *āvuso Gotamo.* Only on the fourth occasion, they give in and address the Buddha as *bhante.*

The Buddha addresses the *bhikkhus* (monks) as *Bhikkkave,* when they are in groups, and individual monks with their personal name or *gotta* name.[29] The text refers to some monks by their ethnic affiliations. Thus we find monks such as Visākha Pañcālaputta, Upasena Vaṅgataputta, Sākyaputta Upananda and Dabba Mallaputta.[30] Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja, Mahāmoggalāna, Kaccāyana monks are

mentioned by their *gotta* affiliations.[31] We notice, however, a difference in the mode of address used for them by the Buddha. Names indicating ethnic affiliations are dropped in addressing those monks possessing them, while the *gotta* is retained in the case of monks whose names indicate *gotta* affiliations. Thus Upananda Sākyaputta is addressed as *Upananda* by the Buddha,[32] while Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja is addressed by him as *Bhāradvāja.*[33] The latter practise is strikingly shown in the following case. The Buddha addressed a novice referred to in the text as *samaṇaudessa* Aciravata as *Aggivessana*, his *gotta* name.[34] In this case, even when the *gotta* name is not alluded to in the initial description of the individual, it is revealed in the mode of address.

The Buddha and the Gahapatis

The formalised mode of address for the Buddha used by the *gahapatis* is *bhante.* The Buddha addresses them as *gahapati.* On meeting the Buddha they salute him (*abhivādeti*).[35]

There is, however, one noteworthy case of a certain Poṭaliya, who resents being called merely *gahapati.* He points out to the Buddha that it is improper and unsuitable that he should be addressed as thus.[36] He had given up all avocations (*vohāra samuccheda*), handed over the property and wealth to his sons and "totally withdrawn from giving advice and instructions to others."[37] Poṭaliya also claims that he lives on a minimum of food and covering. He addresses the Buddha as *bho Gotama*, thus assuming a status of equality for himself. Only after listening to the Buddha does he address him as *bhante.* The statement of the *gahapati* Poṭaliya indicates that he still assumed the full responsibility of household. Despite his austere way of life, he is still a layman.

The Buddha invariably addresses the *gahapatis* by their term of reference, *gahapati.* He does not address them by their names, although the term of reference contains *gahapati* coupled either with the personal names, nicknames or professional names.

Only in one notable case was this convention, of addressing the *gahapati* in this manner, broken. *Gahapati*

Anāthapiṇḍika, who is elsewhere addressed as *gahapati* by the Buddha[38] is only once addressed by his personal name Sudatta.[39] The reaction on Anāthapiṇḍika was instantaneous. Anāthapiṇḍika was much elated and was overwhelmed with joy that the Buddha should call him by his personal name. The incident clearly indicates the obliteration of the social distance which existed between the *gahapati* and the Buddha. The Buddha addresses the *gahapatiputtas* (sons of householders), however, by their personal names.[40]

The Buddha and the Kings

The respect given to the Buddha by kings is seen from their use of *bhante* and their offering of proper salutation (*abhivādeti*).[41] Only once does the king Pasenadi of Kosala address the Buddha as *bho Gotama*, on his first visit to him. It must be noted that the king has only heard about the greatness of the Buddha and has yet to see him. On seeing him, he exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) with him; after listening to the Buddha he changes his mode of address from *bho* to *bhante*.[42] After this instance Pasenadi of Kosala uses *bhante* and salutes (*abhivādeti*) the Buddha, in most of his encounters with him.[43]

The Buddha addresses the kings with their title *mahārāja*. For the princes he uses, *rājakumāra* and in turn is addressed as *bhante*. [44]

The Buddha and the Gāmaṇis

In his conversation with the Buddha, the *gāmaṇi* addresses him as *bhante* and salutes him (*abhivādeti*). The *gāmaṇi* is referred to in the text as *gāmaṇi*, and addressed as such by the Buddha.[45] In one particular instance, however, a change in the mode of address by the *gāmaṇi* to the Buddha, seems to have resulted in a change of status of the Buddha in the mind of the *gāmaṇi*.[46] Pāṭaliya the *gāmaṇi* once approaches the Buddha and asks him either to confirm or deny the rumours that the *samaṇa Gotama* knew magic. He addresses the Buddha as *bhante Bhagavā* and salutes him (*abhivādeti*). The Buddha replies that those who alleged that he knew magic spoke in accordance with his views. When the *gāmaṇi* hears this, he at once lapses into

the familiar *bho Gotama*, and in anger he says, "So after all the *samaṇa*, *bho Gotama*, is a trickster (*māyāvī*)." Thus the change in the attitude of the *gāmaṇi*, from one of respect to one of low esteem, is reflected in the change in the mode of address, from *bhante Bhagavā* to *bho Gotama*.[47]

The Buddha and the Extended Kin-groups

The Buddha addresses the members of his Sākya group, whether members of his order or not, by their personal names. He follows the same practise while addressing the members of other extended kin-groups such as the Lic chavis and others.[48]

It is noteworthy that the Mallas from Pāvā when in groups are addressed by the Buddha as *Vāseṭṭhas*;[49] the Sākyas, too, on one occasion are addressed as *Gotamā* (belonging to Gotama *gotta*).[50] Buddha addresses his father as *Gotama*.[51] And he is himself addressed as *Gotama* by others. The *gotta* name is considered a mark of respect and it seems to be used as a status symbol. We cannot definitely say whether the *gotta* terms such as *Vāseṭṭa* and *Gotama* are those of the brāhmaṇa teachers of the respective extended kin-groups. Presumably it was common among the non-brāhmaṇas to take their *gotta* from that of their *purohita* or family priest. There is only one instance in the text where we find the use of a totemic name *Vyagghapajja*. The Buddha uses this to address a Koliyan.[52]

Buddha is always addressed as *bhante*,[53] followed by *Bhagavā*, by the members of extended kin-groups, and as a mark of respect they salute him (*abhivādeti*). Exception is to be found in the case of Daṇḍapāṇi Sākya.[54] He greets (*s.s.*) the Buddha but stands at one side leaning on his stick. Addressing the Buddha as *samaṇa*, Daṇḍapāṇi asks the Buddha to declare his views and teachings. When the Buddha proclaims his teachings, Daṇḍapāṇi, "stick in hand, shaking his head and wagging his tongue departs, leaning on his stick, his brow furrowed into three wrinkles." The Buddha also shows his social distance from Daṇḍapāṇi by addressing him as *āvuso* and not by his personal name.

The Buddha and the Upāsakas

In this we include the social relations of the Buddha with the remainder of his followers, who cannot be conveniently accommodated in the other groups. This residual category has no terms denoting group affiliations such as *gahapati*, brāhmaṇas, etc. The Buddha showed his intimacy by calling the *upāsakas* by their names.[55] One of them, Dīghāvu, addresses his father Jotipāla with the epithet *gahapati*, though he is not referred to as *gahapati putta.*[56] The term *upāsaka* covers him, but also has a wider connotation and is applicable to any lay devotee or follower of the Buddha. We have also included in this category the royal minister and commander-in-chief of the army.

The *upāsakas* address the Buddha as *bhante* and *Bhagavā*, salute (*abhivādeti*) him, and, before leaving, circumambulate. In one notable instance, the Buddha addresses a poor worker (*daḷiddo kammakāro*), who is an *upāsaka*, as *āvuso.* The text describes this poor man without mentioning his name. Buddha seems to have elevated his status by calling him *āvuso.* As the story goes, this man borrows money in order to give a sumptuous meal to the Buddhist monks. This may be another reason why he is addressed as *āvuso.*[57]

The Buddha and the Others

Those who do not know the identity of the Buddha consider him to be *samaṇa* and address him as such. No salutation (*abhivādeti*) or exchange of greetings (*s.s.*) is indicated. When the Buddha goes to meet the ferocious robber Aṅgulimāla, goat-herds, farmers, and travellers try to stop him and request him not to go further. They address him as *samaṇa.*[58] The Buddha faces Aṅgulimāla without any fear and steadily walks towards him. Aṅgulimāla, calling him a *samaṇa* asks him to stop where he is. This indicates that *samaṇa*, although a term of respect, denotes a certain indifference. Its use indicates the group status, which is that of an unorthodox ascetic. Although we have excluded any non-human beings such as *devas* and *yakkhas* in this chapter, we may mention here an instance where the Buddha converses with the *yakkhas.* The Buddha was once waylaid by two *yakkhas* who want to know whether he is a *samaṇa*

or *samaṇaka*. They stop him with the mode of address *samaṇa* and ask him questions, till they are satisfied that he is a true *samaṇa*.

Monks and Monks

Before setting forth the actual mode of address between the monks and other monks, we point to the instructions the Buddha gave to Ānanda before his final release (*parinibbāna*).[59] The Buddha said, "Ānanda, when I am gone, do not address one another in the way in which monks have been addressing each other up till now, with the epithet *āvuso*. A younger monk may be addressed by an elder (*thera*) either with his name, by his *gotta* or as *āvuso*. But an elder should be addressed by a junior monk as *bhante* or as *āyasmā*." However, the use of the *gotta* name to address the elder was later on permitted by the Buddha.[60]

The commonest mode of address among the monks was *āvuso*.[61] The term *āvuso* is usually followed either by the monk's personal name or by his *gotta* name. It seems that the term *bhante*,[62] which later became a common mode of address for the senior monks, came into vogue after the Buddha's death. This may also reflect the growing organization of the Buddhist from loose groups of mendicants into a highly disciplined *saṃgha*. It is also worth noting that such monks as Anuruddha, Mahākassapa, Upāli, Mahākaccāna and Sāriputta, who are addressed as *bhante* by some of the other monks, are of considerable seniority and importance.

It is important to note that Anuruddha took charge of the assembly of monks immediately after the death of the Buddha. He consoled the weeping monks and sent Ānanda to convey the news of the Buddha's death to the Mallas of Kusināra on whose land the Buddha had died.[63] Mahākassapa's role is equally important. On hearing the news of the Buddha's death, he hurriedly started towards Kusināra, where the Mallan chiefs were trying unsuccessfully to set fire to the funeral pyre on which lay the Buddha's body. The wood would not catch fire until Mahākassapa saluted (*abhivādeti*) the feet of the Buddha. The pyre miraculously caught fire and the Buddha's body was consumed. Mahākassapa was also the chief amongst those who

convened the first council.[64]

In chapters xi and xii of the *Cullavagga*, the consistency in the observance of the rules of seniority (through *bhante*) made Otto Franke feel that these chapters were added later as a form of exercise, according to the instructions of the Buddha as he laid them down to Ānanda in the *Mahāparinibbāṇa sutta*, to which we referred above.[65]

Below the monks in the Buddhist hierarchical ladder were the novices, known as *samaṇuddesa*. They address the monks (referred to as *āyasmā*) as *bhante*, and salute them (*abhivādeti*).

There are many regulations which affect the monk's behaviour within the *saṃgha*. Some of these regulations paved the way for the internal classification of the monks and their gradation according to seniority. Paying of reverence, rising up in reverence, salutation (*abhivādeti*), proper respect and appointment of the best seat, serving of water and food, says the Buddha, "shall be done according to seniority."[66] At present, we are concerned with those descriptions dealing with the outward behaviour of the monks which indicate the scale of seniority within the monastic fold.

In most cases on meeting each other the monks exchange greetings (*s.s.*). In the case of the Buddha-monk relationship, at the end of the conversation with him, the monk salutes (*abhivādeti*) circumambulates and leaves. Among themselves monks follow a different procedure. Thus the monk Yamaka approaches Sāriputta, exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) and in the end compliments (*abhinandati*) Sāriputta on his discourse.[67]

Generally, the texts refer to the monks with *āyasmā* prefixed to their names. During the conversation, sometimes, the monks refer to other monks similarly. Thus on meeting Ānanda, the monk Channa, exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) with him and they address each other as *āvuso*. Later on, in the religious conversation, Channa says to Ānanda, "*Āvuso*, may the *āyasmā* Ānanda teach me, so that I may see the *dhamma*."[68] Sāriputta and Moggallāna, who are described at one place as staying in the same cell, are noted for their friendship. They exchange greetings (*s.s.*) and address each other as *āvuso*. In the course of conversation, however,

they refer to each other as *āyasmā*.[69]

There are exceptions where the monks are not referred to as *āyasmā*. For example, in the case of the monk Ariṭṭha, whenever his name occurs, it is also added that he had formerly been a vulture-trainer and that he held pernicious views (*pāpakadiṭṭhi*).[70]

The *Chabbaggiya* monks, who committed all sorts of crimes,[71] and the monks Mettiya and Bhūmija,[72] also fall into the category of those who are disapprovingly referred to simply as *bhikkhu* and not as *āyasmā*. Devadatta, who joined the Buddhist order, and was responsible for sowing dissension in the community, and who actually hatched a plot to defile and murder the Buddha, is mentioned without any sort of appellation.[73] However, all these monks, considered bad by the compilers of the texts, are addressed as *āvuso* by other monks.

Monks and Paribbājakas

The monks and the *paribbājakas* address each other with the epithet *āvuso* and also exchange greetings (*s.s.*).[74] The actual relationship between the monks and *paribbājakas*, however, is not always friendly. Thus a number of *paribbājakas* belonging to different schools come to the monk Anurādha, exchange greetings (*s.s.*) with him and address him as *āvuso*. The *paribbājakas*, however, are dissatisfied at the end of his discourse and say of him, "This *bhikkhu* must be a novice (*navo*) not long ordained, or if he is an elder (*thero*), he is an ignorant fool."[75] Poṭaliputta the *paribbājaka* exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) with the monk Samiddhi and uses the mutual term of respect *āvuso*. But soon after the conversation, Poṭaliputta takes leave of Samiddhi, "neither rejoicing nor protesting against what Samiddhi had said."[76]

It is different, however, in the case of Ānanda and the *paribbājaka* Kokanuda.[77] Before knowing the identity of Ānanda as a Buddhist monk, Kokanuda addresses him as *āvuso*, but soon afterwards, realizing his mistake, he changes his mode of address from *āvuso* to *āyasmā*. Kokanuda thus uses the more respectful term of reference instead of *āvuso*, the usual mode of address. Although this incident does not result in a change of faith on the part of

the *paribbājaka*, it may none the less reflect the growing respect felt for Ānanda by others.

Paribbājakas with *gotta* affiliation are addressed by their *gotta*, and the mode of address is somewhat different in that *āvuso* is omitted. The monk Moggallāna exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) with Vacchagotta the *paribbājaka* and addresses him as *bho Vaccha*. In reply Vaccha addresses him as *bho Moggallāna*.[78]

Monks and Brāhmaṇas

Brāhmaṇas behave towards the monks in much the same way as they do towards the Buddha. They address the monks with the term *bho* coupled with their names. In turn the monks address the brāhmaṇas as *brāhmaṇa*, without, however, using their personal or *gotta* names.[79] Like the Buddha, the monks either address brāhmaṇa youths as *māṇava* or use their personal names.[80] An exception is the case of the monk Nāgita, who exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) with the brāhmaṇa messengers from Kosala and addresses them as *āvuso*.[81]

The form of salutation between the monks and the brāhmaṇa is that of exchange of greetings (*s.s.*). Although an equality of status. Thus in the case of the encounter between Ghoṭamukha the brāhmaṇa and the monk Udena, the customary greetings (*s.s.*) and form of address are exchanged (*bho brāhmaṇa*). When, however, Udena sits down first on the best seat without offering one to Ghoṭamukha, the latter keeps standing till he is properly offered one.[82] Another case is that of the meeting of the brāhmaṇa woman teacher, Veraccānī, and the monk Udena. Greetings are exchanged (*s.s.*) and the proper forms of address used. After the meal the brāhmaṇa woman requests the monk to recite the *dhamma*. She addresses him as *samaṇa*, occupies a higher seat, veils herself and wears sandals. The monk refuses her request and leaves the place. The incident is repeated thrice and only on the fourth occasion does the brāhmaṇa woman change her total behaviour. She addresses the monk by the term *bhante*, a very unusual act for a brāhmaṇi.[83]

Monks and Kings

Some of the kings who encounter the monks, exchange greetings with them (*s.s.*) and address them with the term *bho.*[84] Probably because of their deep faith, kings such as Pasenadi of Kosala, Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha and king Muṇḍa, address the monks as *bhante* and offer salutation (*abhivādeti*).[85] The monks address them with their title *mahārāja.* The prince Jayasena is addressed as *rājakumāra* by the monk Bhūmija, who is in turn addressed as *bho Bhūmija.*[86]

Monks and Extended Kin-groups

The members of the extended kin-groups invariably address the monks as *bhante* and also offer salutations (*abhivādeti*). Like the Buddha, the monks address the members of the extended kin-groups with their personal names, but sometimes *āvuso* is added as a prefix to the names.[87] While addressing the Mallas, the monks Anuruddha and Ānanda use the Mallas' *gotta* affiliation, *Vāseṭṭhā*; in the case of the Koḷiyans Ānanda uses their totemic name, *Vyāgghapajjā.*[88]

Monks and Gahapatis

All the *gahapatis* address the monks as *bhante* and also salute them (*abhivādeti*). The monks in speaking to *gahapatis* use the term *gahapati*, which is also a term of reference.[89] *Gahapatis* generally do not distinguish between elder and junior monks. Dhasama the *gahapati* salutes (*abhivādeti*) and addresses as *bhante* a nameless *bhikkhu* (*aññatara bhikkhu*) as well as Ānanda, who is widely known in the Buddhist *Saṃgha* because of his nearness to the Buddha himself.[90] *Gahapatis* sometimes refer to the monks as *ayyā* along with the name of the monk, usually preceded by the term *bhante.*

In the event of estrangement between monks and *gahapatis*, it is the monk, although ritually superior to the *gahapati*, who is made to change his behaviour and come to terms with the *gahapati.*

The following case illustrates this: [91]

> A monk Suddhamma is described as a regular diner (*dhubhattika*) at the *gahapati* Citta's house. Suddhamma is also a constant advisor of the *gahapati* on matters concerning invitations to monks, either individually or in groups. Many well known elder monks such as Sāriputta, Moggallāna, Mahākaccāna and Anuruddha visit Citta, and greatly please him by giving him religious talks. Following this, Citta invites them to a meal, without, however, consulting Suddhamma on this matter. He only asks Suddhamma to come and join them at the meal. Suddhamma takes this as a deliberate affront and refuses the invitation. Out of jealousy, Suddhamma goes in the morning to Citta's house to see what has been prepared for the guests.
>
> Citta welcomes him by saluting him (*abhivādeti*), and offers him a seat. But Suddhamma's mind is set on the food and he points out to Citta that out of the plentiful dishes the sesamum cake has been left out. This outrages the *gahapati* Citta, who remarks that for all the Buddha's doctrine, the monk could think only of sesamum cake. The monk takes this remark as an insult and directly accuses the *gahapati* of reviling him, threatening to leave the premises immediately. In a very restrained manner, the *gahapati* still addressing him as *bhante*, asks Suddhamma to calm down and to remain in his house, which is still open to him. In spite of this treatment, the monk goes away to the Buddha and tells him the story. The Buddha, however, rebukes the monk. "How can you, foolish man," the Buddha says, "over a low thing jeer and scoff at the *gahapati* Citta when he has faith in the doctrine, and is a benefactor, a promoter and a supporter of the *saṃgha*."[92] The Buddha then asks the community to carry out a formal act of reconciliation for the monk Suddhamma, saying to him, "*Gahapati* Citta should be asked to forgive you." Suddhamma in the end asks for forgiveness and is in turn

forgiven by the *gahapati*.

Monks and Upāsakas

As mentioned earlier, in the category of the *upāsakas* we include the rest of the lay followers of the Buddha who cannot be grouped otherwise. They address the monks as *bhante* and salute them (*abhivādeti*). The monks in turn address the *upāsakas* as *āvuso*,[93] occasionally using their personal names. Thus the monk Mahākaccāna addresses the *upāsaka* Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa as Soṇa[94] and the *upāsaka* Sāḷha is addressed by the monk Nandaka as *Sāḷha*.[95] The appellation *ayyā* is used by the *upāsakas* as a term of reference following *bhante*.

In the case of misconduct on the part of the monks the *upāsakas* look down upon them and criticise them. In such cases the term of reference undergoes a change. The following will illustrate this. A certain widow salutes (*abhivādeti*) the monk Udāyi (referred to as *āyasmā* in the text) and addresses him as *bhante*. The monk asks her to cohabit with him and she consents. But afterwards he changes his mind and, calling her an evil smelling wench, departs. Udāyi's conduct enrages the woman. She shouts, "These Sākyaputta *samaṇas* are lecherous liars." In her anger, she refers to Udāyi as *samaṇa* Udāyin.[96]

Monks and Others

Generally the monks in groups are identified by others as *Sākyaputta samaṇas*. This is the stock term of reference in the *Vinaya* whenever the people are critical of a monk's doings in general.[97] The people thus allude to their group affiliation which is that of an unorthodox *samaṇa*. In the royal palace the monks were criticised because they were reported as receiving gifts of gold and silver from others. This allegation, however, was refuted by the *gāmaṇi* Maṇicūḷaka.[98] Here, too, the monks are referred to as *Sākyaputta samaṇas*. It may be remarked that the criticism only brings forth the true group affiliations of the Buddhist monks, as members of a large class containing many sects of unorthodox ascetics.

In one particular case, the monk identifies himself as a *Sākyaputta samaṇa*. Kokanuda the *paribbājaka* meets

Ānanda at the Tapoda Park near Rājagaha, and he asks, "Who are you *āvuso* ?" "I am a *bhikkhu, āvuso,*" replies Ānanda. "One of what *bhikkhus*?" Kokanuda again asks. "One of *Sākyaputta samaṇas,*" says Ānanda.[99]

The residual category, which include robbers, relatives, strangers on the high road and others, address the monks as *bhante* and are in turn addressed as *āvuso.*

Gahapatis and Jains

The *Majjhima Nikāya* describes Niganṭha Nāṭaputta as being in a large company of householders (*gihi-parisāya*), headed by *gahapati* Upāli of Bālaka. *Gahapati* Upāli addresses the Niganṭha as *bhante* and salutes him (*abhivādeti*). Soon afterwards he becomes a staunch devotee of the Buddha, so much so that he gives instructions that no alms should be given to the followęrs of the Niganṭha Nāṭaputta. When, however, the latter comes to see him, Upāli addresses him with his customary *bhante*, but drops his usual mode of salutation. Moreover, he does not offer Niganṭha Nāṭaputta the best seat but keeps it for himself. The Niganṭha takes this to be a deliberate insult.[100] In another instance we find that the *gahapati* Citta, a loyal devotee of the Buddha, addresses the Niganṭha Nāṭaputta with *bhante.* However, he also does not salute him (*abhivādeti*), but exchanges greetings (*s.s.*).[101] The Jains address the *gahapatis* as *gahapati.*

Gahapatis and Paribbājakas

The *gahapati* Citta, a staunch follower of the Buddha whom we have mentioned above, addresses Acela Kassapa, an old family friend (*gihisāhaka*), as *bhante* ; but he only exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) with him and does not salute him.[102]

We mention here a group of religious mendicants (*sambahula titthiyā*) and a certain *paribbājaka*, whom the *gahapati* Meṇḍaka and Vijayamāhita address as *bhante* and to whom they show their respect by saluting them. In return these *paribbājakas* address them as *gahapatis.*[103]

Gahapatis and Brāhmaṇas

When the brāhmaṇa Subha Todeyyaputta comes to Sāvatthi on some business, he stays with a certain *gahapati*. Subha expresses a wish to pay respect to the *samaṇa*-brāhmaṇas who were *arahats*, as he had heard that Sāvatthi is frequented by them. The *gahapati* urges Subha to go and visit the Buddha at the Jetavana in Sāvatthi. The non-brāhmaṇa *gahapati* addresses the brāhmaṇa as *bhante* and refers to the Buddha as *Bhagavā*. It may be noted here that *Bhagavā* is a term mostly used by his *upāsakas* to refer to the Buddha. The others refer to him as *samaṇa Gotama*. It is, therefore, quite likely that the *gahapati* was an *upāsaka* of the Buddha. The brāhmaṇa Subha refers to and addresses the *gahapati* as such.[104]

Gahapatis and Kings

The king refers to the *gahapati* Meṇḍaka with the term *gahapati*, which is mentioned with the latter's name. There seems to be only one instance of a talk between a *gahapati* and the king. The king Seniya Bimbisāra addresses the *gahapati* Anāthapiṇḍika as *gahapati*, while the *gahapati* addresses the king as *deva*.[105]

Prince Jeta, a well known and distinguished man (*abhiññāto ñātamanusso*), owns the Jetavana, a pleasure resort near Sāvatthi. Anāthapiṇḍika approaches him to buy the Jetavana, in order to donate it to the Buddhist Saṃgha. Anāthapiṇḍika addresses the prince Jeta as *ayyaputta* and in turn is addressed as *gahapati*.[106]

Gahapati and Gāmaṇis

There is no actual case of conversation between a *gāmaṇi* and a *gahapati*. However, the *gāmaṇi* Asibandhakaputta shows his acquaintance with the doings of a *gahapati* who was a peasant (*kassaka*). Asibandhakaputta refers to him as *gahapati*.[107]

Gahapatis and Others

We give below the style of address used by the *gahapati* in conversation with his sons, his friends and relatives and

his employees. The young men of the family (*kulaputta*), such as Raṭṭhapāla and Sudinna, after they have become monks, address their fathers as *gahapati*, while the latter still retain the mode of address *tāta* for their sons.[108] Dīghāvu, however, though still only an *upāsaka*, addresses his father Jotipāla as *gahapati*.[109] The wives of the *gahapatis* also address their husbands as *gahapati*. Thus Nakula's mother addresses Nakula's father as *gahapati*.[110] *Gahapati* Citta is sick, stricken with a sore disease. His friends, acquaintances and agnates (*mittāmaccā ñātisālohitā*) come to see him. At their request *gahapati* Citta instructs them with the Buddha's teachings. Throughout the conversation, the friends, acquaintances and agnates use the term *ayyaputta* to address him, and not *gahapati*.[111]

The *gahapatis*' employees address him as *bhante*. Thus *gahapati* Sirivaddha instructs a certain man (*aññatara puriso*) to deliver a message to Ānanda. He addresses the messenger as *ambho purisa*, and in turn is addressed as *bhante gahapati*.[112] Upāli's doorkeeper addresses him as *bhante*.[113]

Gahapatis and Gahapatis

On meeting one another, *gahapatis* exchange greetings (*s.s.*) and the mutual term of address is *gahapati*. Thus Anāthapiṇḍika addresses the *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Rājagaha as *gahapati*; in reply he is addressed as *gahapati*. An exchange of greetings also takes place (*s.s.*).[114]

Brāhmaṇas and Brāhmaṇas

The brāhmaṇa group falls into a number of subgroups. The brāhmaṇas such as Pokkharasādi, Kuṭadanta and Soṇadaṇḍa, represent a sub-group who had sovereign rights over their lands, which were given to them by the kings. Another sub-group comprises students, householders and so on. Within the group status differences are played down, and the brāhmaṇas use *bho* to address each other.[115] The brāhmaṇa Brahmāyu addresses his pupil Uttara as *tāta*, a kinship term used between father and son. In return Uttara addresses him as *bho*.[116] This term of address is often coupled with either the personal name or the *gotta*

name.

Brāhmaṇas and Kings

The brāhmaṇas address the king either with his title *deva* or with *bho*, but do not address the kings with the title *mahārāja* commonly used by the monks, the Buddha and the *paribbājakas*. The king addresses them as *brāhmaṇa*.[117] One exception is that of a young brāhmaṇa student, Sudassana, whom king Pasenadi of Kosala addresses as *tāta*.[118]

Another exception is when the king Pasenadi of Kosala, in his formal invitation to the brāhmaṇa Sañjaya of Ākāsagotta, addresses the latter as *bhante*. Later on, however, the king addresses the same brāhmaṇa with the epithet *brāhamaṇa*. The brāhmaṇa in turn addresses the king as *mahārāja* and not *deva*.[119] We may note here that he is a well known brāhmaṇa whom the king and his army chief consult on religious and philosophical matters. The king extends to the brāhmaṇa an invitation to come and see him. In the meantime, the king consults the Buddha on his problems and is satisfied by the answers the Buddha gives to him. So when Ākāsagotta arrives, he has no need for a consultation with the brāhmaṇa; hence the change of address from *bhante* to *brāhmaṇa*. This may thus show the gradual lowering of the status of the brāhmaṇa in the eyes of the king.

Brāhmaṇa, Prince and Barber

We give below evidence of the relationships of the three groups which indicate the hierarchical position of each. The prince Bodhi instructs a brāhmaṇa youth, Sañjikāputta to deliver a message inviting the Buddha to a meal. The Prince asks the brāhmaṇa messenger to bow down and salute (*abhivādeti*) the Buddha (*bhante Bhagavā*) on his behalf, and to address the Buddha thus: "Prince Bodhi bows down in salutation at the feet of *bhante Bhagavā* and enquires whether he is free from sickness and suffering and is in enjoyment of ease and comfort and vigorous health. May *Bhagavā* together with *saṃgha*, consent to take his meal with Bodhi tomorrow." The brāhmaṇa messenger, disregarding the instructions, exchanges

greetings (*s.s.*) and takes his seat. He repeats the formal invitation but not without substituting *bhoto Gotamassa, bhavaṃ Gotamo* (variations of *bho Gotama*), for *bhante Bhagavā*. Later on also, while announcing the meal, he retains the specific mode of address, *bho Gotama.* Prince Bodhi addresses Sañjikāputta as *samma Sañjika*; in turn, he is addressed as *bho.*[120]

In the second case, the brāhmaṇa Lohicca[121] instructs the barber Bhesika to deliver a message inviting the Buddha to a meal. The brāhmaṇa uses the term *bho gotama* (also *bhavantaṃ Gotamaṃ, bhavaṃ Gotamo*) which is the same as above. Moreover, "the salutation and bowing down" at the feet of the Buddha are also absent from his instructions as well as the message. Yet the barber substitutes his own mode of behaviour for that given in his instructions, addressing the Buddha as *bhante, Bhagavā*, and acting as non-brāhmaṇa should. The brāhmaṇa Lohicca addresses the barber as *samma* Bhesika while the barber addresses the brāhmaṇa as *bhante.*

These two cases show how the brāhmaṇa and the barber retain their specific behaviour towards the Buddha, which is determined by their affiliation to their respective groups. The fact that they are both messengers does not affect their behaviour.

Brāhmaṇas and Paribbājakas

Both the *paribbājaka* Māgaṇḍiya and the brāhmaṇa Bhāradvājagotta address each other as *bho.*[122] As mentioned earlier equality of status is denoted by the modes of address used. In the encounter between the brāhmaṇa Jāṇussoṇi and the *paribbājaka* Pilotika, the former uses the latter's *gotta* name *Vacchāyana* to address him. The *paribbājaka* uses *bho.*[123]

Brāhamaṇas and Ruling Extended Kin-groups

The brāhmaṇa Doṇa in the *Mahāparinibbāṇa Sutta* addresses, among others, the Mallas of Kusināra and Pāvā, as *bho* (in the plural *bhonto*). The brāhmaṇa Doṇa is addressed as *brāhmaṇa.*[124]

Analysis

At the beginning of this chapter we mentioned that it is possible to draw inferences about the outline of the social order through a study of the terms of address, reference and modes of salutation. We also maintained that the Buddha was in a central position inside this order. We shall now examine how far our contentions are justifiable from the data which we have presented.

As a result of our detailed examination of the data, it is possible to discern the broad groups under which we have presented the examples of interpersonal behaviour. These groups, obviously, are not mutually exclusive categories, and hence it is quite possible for individuals to belong to more than one group.

Before we proceed further, it will be useful to enumerate the groups. They are: (1) The Buddha; (2) Brāhmaṇas; (3) *Gahapatis*; (4) Kings and Princes; (5) *Gāmaṇis*; (6) Monks; (7) *Upāsakas*; (8) Persons belonging to the extended kin-groups; (9) *Paribbājakas* and Jains; and (10) Others. It is not difficult to see from this that the groups are neither of a uniform nature in terms of their functions nor equal in size. Functionally, these groups are primarily (1) Social; (2) Religious; and (3) Political. We use the term social in a narrow sense here to cover those aspects of society which cannot be categorised as religious, political or economic. In the first category, of course, come (1) the Buddha; (2) the brāhmaṇas; (3) the *gahapatis*; (4) the persons belonging to the extended kin-groups; and (5) the others. In the second category come (1) the Buddha; (2) the brāhmaṇas; (3) the *upāsakas*; (4) the persons belonging to extended kin-groups; (5) the *paribbājakas*; (6) the Jains; and (7) the others. In the last category are: (1) the Buddha; (2) the kings and princes; (3) the *gāmaṇis*; and (4) the *gahapatis*. It is in terms of these functional groups that we shall attempt to establish ranking. It cannot be sufficiently emphasised that any single individual may occupy different positions which decide his actual relationship. Having analysed the instances of actual interpersonal behaviour in terms of these groupings, we attempt to rank the groups in terms of the functional categories outlined above.

Social Relationship

In their relationship with the Buddha, the brāhmaṇas maintain an uncompromising attitude of equality, as can be envisaged from their modes of address (*bho*) and salutation (*saddhiṃ sammodi*). On his part the Buddha recognises the special position of the brāhmaṇas in society and their caste claims by addressing them as *brāhmaṇa*. The Buddha also refrains from addressing brāhmaṇas by their personal names and whenever possible uses their *gotta* names. In fact, the *gotta* affiliation appears to be so important that whenever available it is used by the Buddha in preference to any other forms of address. This can especially be seen from the instances where the Mallas of Pāvā and Kusināra are addressed as *Vāseṭṭhās* although in the ordinary course of events they would be addressed, when in groups, as *Mallas*.[125] It appears that possession of a *gotta* name is a predominantly brāhmaṇic feature, reserved mainly for the brāhmaṇas, but also extended to the members of extended kin-groups who have to some extent come under brāhmaṇic influence. Thus as if in reciprocation of the Buddha's acceptance of this brāhmaṇic element, they also address the Buddha with his *gotta* name.

There is, however, an active conflict involved in the Buddha-brāhmaṇa relationship. Often, the brāhmaṇas take offence at some attitude or action on the part of the Buddha or his followers and lapse into addressing the Buddha as *samaṇa Gotama*. Sometimes the brāhmaṇas' hostility towards the Buddha and his order exists without any immediate cause. In such a case *samaṇa Gotama* is used and exchange of greetings (*s.s.*) is deliberately omitted. The angry and insulting nature of such behaviour is explicitly recognized in the text whenever such a situation is depicted. The connotation of *samaṇa* as a mode of address becomes apparent only when we realize that the robber Aṅgulimāla, the social outcaste, is the person who addresses the Buddha as such and omits to exchange greetings (*s.s.*) with him.[126]

Towards brāhmaṇa youths, the Buddha's attitude is more mellow, yet no less formal. He uses the term *māṇavā*, or in more familiar cases their personal names. The youths on

their part do not treat the Buddha differently from their elders.

Though disrespectful as a term of address, as a term of reference, *samaṇa* is not necessarily derogatory. The brāhmaṇas refer to the Buddha and his monks by this term. In fact Ānanda once initially identifies himself as a *bhikkhu* but on further questioning does not mind describing himself as *Sākyaputta samaṇa*. This was perhaps the common descriptive term for the Buddhist monks in circles outside that of their followers.

In comparison with the foregoing, the Buddha's relationship with members of various extended kin-groups is definitely closer. The members of such groups address the Buddha as *bhante*, the form used by all the followers of the Buddha, monks and others. They invariably salute him (*abhivādeti*). The Buddha on his part recognises the identity which they feel with him and addresses them by their personal names in most instances. Only when in groups does he use their extended kin-groups affiliation to address them. Even here, as we have pointed out before, he recognises their *gotta* affiliation, a brāhmaṇic element.

The relationships between the brāhmaṇas and the members of the extended kin-groups are analogous to those existing between the brāhmaṇas and the Buddha. Whereas the brāhmaṇas address the members of the extended kin-groups as *bho*, the latter use the term *brāhmaṇa*. There is the usual exchange of greetings (*s.s.*). But though there are several cases of hostility between the brāhmaṇas and the Buddha, we can find no instances in which the brāhmaṇas show overt signs of hostility towards members of the extended kin-groups. Apparently they do not feel any challenge to their secular position coming from these people.

The *gahapati* group consists of the heads of households, who only are accorded social recognition. In this sense they represent the whole household in its relationship to the other groups. If this is so, it becomes quite clear that as a group they do not exclusively belong to either the Buddhist or the brāhmaṇic order. It can be seen from the data that they include brāhmaṇas among others.

Respectful to the Buddha, the brāhmaṇas, the king and the members of the extended kin-groups (in this context

the members of the politically dominant groups), they address them all (and many others) as *bhante* or *ayyaputta.* Yet their social position is not necessarily low, as can be seen from the fact that brāhmaṇas may also belong to their group. In fact, when they do, the Buddha recognises this fact in addressing them as *gahapatayo* in preference to the more correct and formal *brāhmaṇas.* It is also significant that the brāhmanas do not take offence at this.

The term *gahapati* as a mode of address may also involve respect, since the *gahapati*'s son and wives, as we have seen, address him as such. Only his servants, who are definitely inferior to him address him as *bhante*, a term denoting the greatest respect.

To sum up the social ranking; on the one side are the Buddha and the members of the extended kin-groups, where the latter without exception recognize the Buddha's superiority. Their relationship to the Buddha is characterised by respect, apparent in the terms *bhante* and *Bhagavā*, and in salutation (*abhivādeti*). The Buddha on his part accepts his own membership of the group vis-a-vis the group itself as well as the society at large. Below them stand the non-brāhmaṇa *gahapatis*, who accept both the Buddha and the members of the extended kin-groups as superior to them. Below them are their servants. On the other side are the brāhmaṇas (*brāhmaṇa-gahapatis*) who do not accept the Buddha's claim to a superior social position. They insist on treating him solely as a member of an extended kin-group and address him as *bho Gotama*, as they would any other members of the group. Yet in their hostility and uncompromising attitude we see them recognising the Buddha's special position within the society, for the denial of the Buddha's position is, as it were, a negative recognition of it.

On the other hand the *gahapatis* also pay respect to the brāhmaṇas, whatever their individual persuasion. Thus,a *gahapati*, apparently inclined towards the Buddha, does not find any incongruity in welcoming a brāhmaṇa to stay in his home and even enjoining him to go and listen to the Buddha. The Buddha, brāhmaṇas, and *paribbājakas*, command his respect, but none his exclusive attention.

Religious Relationships

The Brāhmaṇic, the Buddhist, and the Jain are the three major religious traditions in existence at the time (we have excluded the Ājīvikas because of the scanty evidence, and have incorporated them into the *paribbājaka* group). Within each of these traditions are those members who have in varying measure renounced mundane considerations and thereby gained a specific position in society. The Brāhmaṇic order consists of the brāhmaṇas who are involved actively (perhaps vocationally) in religious and philosophical activities. Below them come the numerous *paribbājakas*, who include "professional mendicants," living on alms, and also retired hermits in search of salvation. They are not necessarily brāhmaṇas and often enter the Buddhist order, convinced of the Buddha's doctrine, usually at the end of a discourse. Yet, as the stories of these conversions show, at least initially they maintained their position, which was that of equality with the other orders, by addressing the Buddha as *bho*. Even a *gahapati* who had turned a *paribbājaka* maintained his independence by addressing him thus. This incident also shows that *gahapati* is an affiliation commanding a lower degree of respect than *paribbājaka*, presumably because being a *gahapati* did not involve exclusive attention to religion. That the *gahapati* occupies a definitely lower position in religious affairs than all classes of priests or mendicants can be seen by his use of *bhante* for all men of religion irrespective of their allegiance to any order. Nigrodha the *paribbājaka*, however, is an exception. He is addressed by *gahapati* Sandhāna as *bho* instead of the usual *bhante*.[127] But the implication of such an address becomes clear when we find that Nigrodha addresses the Buddha as *bhante*, thus acknowledging himself to be an *upāsaka* of the Buddha as well.

The position of the *upāsaka* was different from that of the *gahapati*. Being actively concerned with religious affairs, the *upāsakas* were convinced of the Buddha's doctrine and became his lay devotees, according to the texts usually converted after an argument with the Buddha or a well-known monk. Among them were brāhmaṇas as well as others. Brāhmaṇa converts generally chose not to

completely relinquish their membership of the brāhmaṇa order and become monks. But while the non-brāhmaṇa *upāsakas* found it easier to retain their membership of the orthodox social order, the brāhmaṇa *upāsakas* had to resort to various subterfuges in openly acknowledging the Buddha as their superior, even when they were intellectually convinced of his superiority. The Buddha, however, became their professed superior if they became monks.

It is obvious that the monks are those nearest to the Buddha in the Buddhist religious order. However, as we have seen from the data, the monks are not a uniform group where everyone is equal. The Buddha himself recognises differences within the *saṃgha.* In fact, we may say that even within the *saṃgha* a person retains his past group affiliation to some extent. This is particularly true of the members of the two important groups, the brāhmaṇas and the extended kin-groups. Although both these groups acknowledge the Buddha's superiority, the brāhmaṇa monks, even the distinguished ones, retain their *gotta* affiliations. Those belonging to the extended kin-groups are invariably addressed more informally with their personal names. Addressing a monk by his *gotta* name, whenever it existed, was made a *Vinaya* rule.

We have already dealt with the different terms used by the monks among themselves. It is sufficient to point out here that *āvuso* denotes equality while *bhante* denotes the addressee's superiority. *Āyasmā* as a term of reference, and in rare cases the term of address, denotes mutual respect, and is more formal than *āvuso.*

We have pointed out the nature of relationships between the Jains and the Buddha and his monks. They have both retracted from the brāhmaṇic order, yet there is no actual recognition of equality. Indeed, there is a fierce competition between them.

The *gahapati*, as has been pointed out, addresses all of them as *bhante*; but does not necessarily remain neutral in the "tripartite struggle" for religious superiority. Thus, Citta the *gahapati* exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) with the Niganṭha Nāṭaputta and the Acela Kassapa, but salutes (*abhivādeti*) the Buddha.[128] This and his other behaviour

infuriate the Niganṭha Nāṭaputta. In general, however, the Jains derive their form of behaviour from the brāhmaṇas, who are equally hostile to the Buddhist order. If at all, they go out of their way to engage in violent discussions with the Buddha and his monks.

To recapitulate then, there are three religious orders, each fighting against the other for superiority. To the brāhmaṇa order belong the brāhmaṇas, the *paribbājakas* some *gahapatis* and others; to the Buddhist order belong the Buddha, the monks (brāhmaṇa and others) and the *upāsakas*. The extended kin-groups are aligned in this struggle on the Buddha's side; the third is the Jain order, comparatively less significant but no less hostile to the others. Their following consists of the Niganṭhas such as Dīgha Tappasi, Saccaka and so on, and lay disciples.

All the three groups contend for superiority in the eyes of the *gahapati* who represents the bulk of society. He is respectful to all men of religion, but sometimes has his own preferences. His importance, from the point of view of the sources, lies in his patronage of one or the other order. Whenever he changes his patronage, the losing order takes it as an insult. That his importance is recognised is seen from the fact that the Buddha orders the monk Suddhamma to seek pardon from the *gahapati* Citta, even when in fact the *gahapati* behaved disrespectfully to the monk first.[129]

Political Relationships

The king obviously is at the head of the political order. His subordinate and representative at the social level is the *gāmaṇi*, the administrative chief of the village. He seems to be recruited from the *gahapati* group but by his political rank is outside them. Of the *gahapatis*, he alone has the courage to challenge the Buddha for being a magician. Conversely, he alone defends the Buddhist monks from various charges in the king's court.[130]

The king is formal in his behaviour to the brāhmaṇas as well as to the Buddha. Like the Buddha, he uses the term *brāhmaṇa* for the priestly class. The young brāhmaṇa he addresses as *tāta*, a term reserved for a son. On the other hand, his attitude towards the Buddha may vary from *bho Gotama* and *saddhiṃ sammodi* to *bhante Bhagavā* and may

thus indicate his religious sympathies.

By the Buddha as indeed by monks and *paribbājakas* (including the leaders of the well known schools of thought such as, the Niganṭha Nāṭaputta, and so on), the king is addressed as *mahārāja.* The employees and the subjects of the king address him as d*eva.*[131] Ākāsagotta, who addresses him as *mahārāja*, as we have seen, is a brāhmaṇa of great spiritual renown, so much so as to be addressed as *bhante* by the king. In this sense he can be said to belong to *paribbājaka* group. On the one hand, the Buddha, the monks, *paribbājakas* and their "fellow travellers" seem to deny any ritual status to the king by addressing him as *mahārāja* which emphasizes the earthly powers of the king; on the other hand, those who address him as *deva*, accept the king's divinity. In other words the king's divinity is not challenged by those within the bonds of the society; those outside it refuse to endow him with that special status.

The *gahapati*'s position vis-a-vis the king is not certain, but the former addresses a prince as *ayyaputta*, denoting not only respect but also some privilege. It is only here that we find the *gahapati* using neither *bhante* nor the less respectful *bho.* The king on his part, like others, refers to the *gahapati* by the title coupled with his personal name.[132]

The *gāmaṇi* usually follows the *gahapati*'s practise in addressing the Buddha as *bhante* and in salutation (*abhivādeti*). Yet he may address the Buddha as *bho Gotama* as in the case of Pāṭali the *gāmaṇi*. Nevertheless, the same *gāmaṇi* refers to the Buddha as *samaṇa bho Gotama* suggesting that he may not go as far as the brāhmaṇas and the *paribbājakas* in disapproving of the Buddha and his order.

The brāhmaṇa's attitude to the king is marked by the term of address to the latter, *bho.* Even when a brāhmaṇa is a minister, his behaviour scarcely changes very much. For instance, when king Ajātasattu sends the brāhmaṇa minister Vassakāra on a mission to the Buddha to find out ways and means of destroying the might of the Vajjis, he addresses Vassakāra as *brāhmaṇa.* Vassakāra addresses the king as *bho.* The message the king commands the brāhmaṇa to deliver is a formal one. The king instructs

Vassakāra to bow down to the feet of the Buddha and convey his salutation (*abhivādeti*) and refers to the Buddha as *Bhagavā*. The brāhmaṇa Vassakāra substitutes his own behaviour for that of the king in his actual encounter with the Buddha. He exchanges greetings (*s.s.*) instead of saluting (*abhivādeti*), addresses the Buddha as *bho Gotama* instead of *bhante Bhagavā* used by the king.[133] The legendary royal chaplain brāhmaṇa Mahāgovinda also behaves with king Reṇu with the same degree of respect as paid by the brāhmaṇa Vassakāra to the king Ajātasattu by addressing the latter as *bho*.[134]

Sometimes, however, there is a deviation in the behaviour of the brāhmaṇas. The brāhmaṇa Vassakāra addresses king Bimbisāra as *deva*.[135] By accepting the divinity of the king the brāhmaṇas tend to enhance their own position in society, as they also claimed divine origin in the text. It was an often repeated claim of the brāhmaṇas that they are the sons of god Brahmā, born out of his mouth.[136]

Summary

In summing up, a number of conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, we have examined various modes of address, reference and salutation, found in the meetings of various persons. We have tried on the one hand to establish the various *de facto* social groups implied in such formulae of address, reference and salutation, ascertaining the group affiliation of the persons involved. On the other hand, we have tried to bring out the meaning of various terms and establish a triple system of ranking. The meaning attached to these terms, we may point out, is specifically interactional, and the proof of its validity lies only in its consistency. We have demonstrated this throughout our presentation of the data as well as the conclusions.

On a different level, our conclusions mainly indicate a threefold system of ranking. In the social sphere the brāhmaṇas successfully maintain their hostile equality with the Buddha. But in the religious and political fields, they are not as successful. In the religious field the Buddhist order more than holds its own and claims several distinguished brāhmaṇas within its fold. Politically, too,

the Buddha is less encumbered than the brāhmaṇas. Unlike them, he is not servile to the king. Despite their actual humility in the king's presence, in their modes of address the brāhmaṇas recognise no superior in any system of ranking, but at the most only equals. They and the Buddhists have an equal hold on the *gahapatis*, who represent the more or less secular population, the prizes in the religious struggle.

Having analysed the social groupings, we may further comment on them and see if we can relate our "inferred" social ranking of the groups to what is already stated about them in the texts. We may select the brāhmaṇas on account of their prominence in the society.

There are direct statements in the texts about the position of the *khattiyas* as superior to that of the brāhmaṇas.[137] Whenever the texts refer to the theoretical four class groupings of *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa*, *sudda*, the *khattiyas* are invariably mentioned first in order of preference, and the brāhmaṇas always in the second position.[138] The textual bias in favour of the *khattiyas* to which the Buddha belonged is obvious.

There are a number of statements regarding the position of the brāhmaṇas, many of these being ascribed to the Buddha himself. The Buddha and his monks often criticize and challenge the claims of the brāhmaṇas that they are the only superior class by virtue of their birth and that the other classes are inferior to them. The brāhmaṇas claimed divine origin.[139] The Buddha was against the brāhmaṇical sacrificial system [140] and certain of their rituals such as *saddhā* (Skt. *śrāddha*), the ancestor cult.[141] At the same time he appreciated brāhmaṇical disciplines such as the concept of *brahmavihāra*, the four stages of mental discipline.[142] The Buddha, in fact, addresses his spiritually highest monks as *brāhmaṇa*.[143] Many brāhmaṇas who joined his order became famous monks. The Buddha's arguments regarding the brāhmaṇas were that they had become degraded in their vocation, which was to lead a life dedicated to study and teaching, and that they needed to be told to behave themselves.[144] The famous saying "not by birth one becomes a brāhmaṇa but by deeds," expresses a similar attitude. One may argue that by denying the

brāhmaṇas their claim to superiority, the Buddha is implicitly admitting their superior position whether actual or professed. This apparent ambiguity as regards the brāhmaṇa position is aptly commented on by Rhys Davids when he says that, in spite of the textual denial of their position, they held by birth a *de facto* social superiority over other classes.[145]

Our method of analysis adds another dimension to the observation made by Rhys Davids. In our triple system of ranking, social, political and ritual, we indicated that the brāhmaṇas recognized no superior in social and ritual ranking, but at the most equals, although politically they were subservient to the ruling aristocracy of the day; and that they were accorded respect in society together with the members of other great religious traditions. One may note that while brāhmaṇas were given this respect in spite of their being active members of society, the monks and the *paribbājakas* had to renounce the society to receive such high ritual and social status. In other words, the brāhmaṇas could be householders, marry and rare children and yet receive high ritual and social standing; the others could not.

Chapter IV
The Gods in Relation to Human Society

THIS chapter examines the early Buddhist world of gods in relation to human society. The high and low gods and other personified supernatural agencies are shown as interacting with the Buddha, the monks, men and women and among themselves. These interactions, viewed alongside the descriptive attributes of the gods and the humans, reveal the standing of the gods *vis-a-vis* each other and the humans. The analysis of the modes of address and salutation used by the gods and humans, attempted in this chapter provides yet another criterion to determine the ranked relationship existing between the speaker and the addressee.

The Buddha assumed that humans, with right efforts, can control their own transmigration; that is, their future rebirths as gods or other supernatural beings. However, the destruction of the *āsavas* should remain, according to the Buddha, the ultimate goal of an initiate in search of freedom from sorrow. That goal was considered superior to the aspiration to be born into the world of this or that god. The notion concerning the pantheon of gods and supernatural beings, prevailing in the age of the Buddha, appears to have been recycled and absorbed in early Buddhism; the gods are needed if only to justify and sanction the value of the Buddha's teachings and his actions and those of his followers. The study of the manner in which the gods are made use of by the Buddha and his monks to elucidate their doctrinal viewpoints, is useful for understanding the Buddha-centered "theology" of early Buddhists.

The Buddha and the Gods

The brāhmaṇa Bhāradvāja asks the Buddha, "Do the gods exist (*atthi devā ti)*?" The Buddha replies, "There is a general consensus in the world that there are gods." When king Pasenadi Kosala asks an identical question, the

Buddha, without giving a direct answer, says that the gods are answerable for their actions: if they have been evil they are reborn in the states they deserve, if not then they remain in their present state as gods.[1] The gods, the *devas*, *devaputtas* and *devatās*, as they are variously referred to in the texts, are shown, like humans, entering into dialogue with the Buddha, asking him questions concerning the doctrinal issues and seeking clarifications of their doubts. The Buddha was, after all, the teacher of the gods and mankind. The Buddha wanting to preach to his son, Rāhula, the final destruction of the *āsavas* takes him to a nearby wooded spot. Thousands of gods follow the Buddha in order to listen to the discourse.[2] A god complains to the monk Samiddhi that "it is not easy for him to approach the Buddha "as he is surrounded by other gods of high stature."[3] The gods, who are beautiful, endowed with long life and well settled in their celestial palaces, when they hear the Buddha teaching that life is impermanent, become frightened and uneasy. The text adds, "Thus potent is the Tathāgata over the *devas* (gods) and their world, of such might, such power has he."[4] The Buddha is utterly disdainful of the allegation of some of the *paribbājakas* that for the sake of rebirth in the *deva* world he practises continence.[5]

Some of the gods are recognized by the Buddha and identified by him as being so and so in a past life, or else the gods themselves reveal the identities of their past births. A god (*devaputta*) comes to the Buddha and says to him that he was the king named Seri who was known for his acts of charity.[6] The *gahapati* Anāthapiṇḍika, a munificent benefactor of the Buddha and his order, is reborn in the Tusita group of gods. The "god Anāthapiṇḍika" illuminates the whole of the Jetavana with his radiant beauty and meets with the Buddha.[7] It is noteworthy that it was the *devaputta* Anāthapiṇḍika who, in his former life, had purchased the Jetavana, and that he had come back to the same locality. The characteristic associations of the former life are thus carried forward in the next. In another instance, Rohitassa *devaputta* asks the Buddha about the possibility of seeing and knowing how to reach the world's end (*lokassa anta*). The Buddha

explains to the monks that Rohitassa, the son of Bhoja, was a sage in his former life. He was endowed with psychic power and was a "sky-walker" (*iddhimā vehāsaṅgamo*).[8]

At the request of the Samacitta *devatās*, the Buddha visits the monk Sāriputta and tells him that groups of ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty and sixty *devas* stood in a space no greater than that made by the point of a gimlet without crowding each other. It was so because their minds (*cittaṃ*) were trained to that attainment.[9] The lesson for Sāriputta is obviously that with proper channelling of the mind one can achieve seemingly impossible objectives. The gods are merely illustrations. The gods are the first ones to be informed of the fate of the monk Vakkhali who commits suicide. The Buddha says to the gods that the monk will win the ultimate release.[10]

The gods confirm the Buddha's statements. The Buddha says that by his own mental power he knows the mind of Vacchagotta is of great psychic power. "The gods also told him so."[11] A god analyses the three factors which lead to a monk's failure: pleasure in worldly activity, pleasure in talk and pleasure in sleep. The text adds that the god spoke and the Buddha approved. The god was pleased that the Buddha was "one in thought" with him and took his leave.[12]

The gods would intervene if they could, to help the Buddha. In the crucial period leading to the Buddha's enlightenment, the Buddha decided to starve himself. The gods urged him to desist from doing so and warned him that if he did not follow their advice they will administer to him *deva*-like food (*dibbaṃ ojaṃ*) through the pores of his skin. The Buddha prevailed upon them not to do so and they listened to him.[13] The gods do intervene to maintain proper social decorum during the Buddha's funeral ceremony. After the Buddha's final passing away, the Buddha's funeral pyre would not catch fire because the senior most monk, Mahākassapa, had not paid his final respects to the Buddha's body. This was the intention of the gods (*devatānaṃ adhippāyo*).[14]

In most encounters involving the Buddha and the gods, the modes of address and salutation used by them define the nearness and the distance of the gods in their

relationship with the Buddha. The standard description mentioned in the text is that the gods on their visits to the Buddha salute him (*abhivādeti)* and stand on one side keeping a distance (*ekmantaṃ aṭṭhāsi).* This standard mode of salutation indicates that the gods have acknow-ledged the Buddha's superior standing. Many of the gods visit the Buddha at dawn and light up the area with their radiance. Some of them hover in the air in a standing position, engaging the Buddha in conversation. However, the gods are not referred to as sitting (*nisīdi*) near the Buddha as was the case with humans who normally followed that procedure in the presence of the Buddha. But the Buddha had access to the world of gods where he would meet with the gods, and, in such meetings, he is shown as sitting in their presence.

The Buddha was generally addressed by the gods with the term *mārisa.* This term represents the status of equality and solidarity which the gods have among themselves.[15] Equally frequently the gods use *bhante* the term of address used for those superior in status.[16] The Buddha uses the term *āvuso* to address the gods. In the *Sakka Pañha Suttanta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya,* the god Sakka, the chief of the Tāvatiṃsa heaven, at one place uses *mārisa* and at another uses *bhante* to address the Buddha. The Buddha addresses Sakka with his term of reference *devānāṃ inda* (the ruler of the gods) and with Kosiya, Sakka's *gotta.* Sakka, of course, makes his salutation and stands on one side.[17]

The Buddha's relationship with Hatthaka *devaputta* is on an intimate basis. He actually helps the *devaputta* to regain his power as a *deva,* the power which has had a temporary relapse in the presence of the Buddha. Hatthaka tries to stand upright in order to approach the Buddha but is unable to do so (*na sakkoti saṇṭhātuṃ*). "Just as butter or oil, when poured upon sand, sinks down, sinks in, cannot remain stable, so Hatthaka *devaputta* sank down, collapsed and could not stand upright." The Buddha then advises him to create a gross body. He follows the Buddha's advice. He addresses the Buddha with *bhante* and the Buddha reciprocates with the term Hatthaka, the god's personal name. Hatthaka, as stated by himself in the text, was a popular god. The gods came from a distance (*dūrato*

devaputtā āgacchanti) to hear him preach the *dhamma.* [18]

By way of contrast the hostile supernatural agencies such as the *yakkhas* in their encounters with the Buddha address him with *samaṇa*, thereby indicating indifference to the Buddha's special status. But the Buddha addresses them with his familiar *āvuso.*[19]

There is only one instance in the text where the Cātum-mahārāja *devas* visit the Buddha with a great army of *yakkhas* and *gandhabba*; some of them salute, others exchange greetings, still others pronounce their names and some remain silent. All of them sit.[20] This is the only passage in the whole of the four *Nikāyas* in which the gods sit. The formula is repeated elsewhere in connection with the monk's meeting with humans.[21] The differential behaviour and the act of sitting is allowable in the case of humans. It seems highly possible that this passage is a later interpolation of the compilers. Adikaram believes that the whole of this section in the *Dīgha Nikāya* was later accretion.[22]

The Buddha and the Brahmā World

The Buddha has the ability to travel back and forth from the Brahmaloka to the world of humans. His senior monks can visit Brahmaloka (especially the monk Moggallāna). Only the Brahmā gods have the privilege (no other lesser god has it) of influencing the Buddha's crucial decision to save mankind. After attaining enlightenment the Buddha doubts the wisdom of men to understand his newly discovered truth. The Buddha wavers in his mind. The Brahmā Sahampati manifests himself before the Buddha, since he knows the troubling thought in the Buddha's mind. He then urges him, for the sake of human welfare, to save mankind by preaching the new doctrine. The Brahmā uses the term *bhante* and salutes him (*abhivādeti).* But he does more than that. Drawing his outer robe over one shoulder, with his right knee pressing the ground, the Brahmā joins his hands in supplication and begs the Buddha to change his mind and preach the *dhamma.* That the Brahmā touches the earth is something extraordinary, since the gods do not kneel on earth, but are always depicted as standing.[23] On the other hand, according to the

brāhmaṇa Verañja, the Buddha is known as one who neither salutes (*abhivādeti)*, nor rises up for (*paccuṭṭheti)*, nor offer a seat to (*āsanena nimanteti)* the senior brāhmaṇas who are advanced in age. The Buddha replies that he sees no one in the world of gods (*sa devake loke*) with Māras and Brahmās or in the world of mankind with its *samaṇas* and brāhmaṇas, *devas* and men, whom he should salute, rise up from his seat for or offer a seat.[24]

The Brahmā gods become aware of the most significant event in the Buddha's life. When the Buddha gives his first discourse, this becomes an epoch-making event. The *devas* of the earth raise a cry extolling this act. Through each of the successive *deva* worlds it reaches up to the Brahmā gods who repeat it. Thus at that very hour, at that very moment, within split second the cry reaches right up to the Brahmā world. The thousandfold world system is shaken to and fro and an immeasurable brilliant light shines forth surpassing even the power of the *devas.* [25]

The presence of the high Brahmā god accentuates and signals the importance of the events. The Buddha became wary about the abilities of his monks who had joined the order recently. He thought they might not live up to his expectations. Dissatisfied with them he asks them to leave his presence. But the Brahmā Sahampati entreats him to soften his stand and harbour good thoughts about them. The Buddha concurs with Brahmā's suggestion.[26] Brahmā's role as mediator emerges from the above episode. When the Buddha achieves his final passing away, Brahmā Sahampati first speaks announcing the event, followed by Sakka, the chief of the Tāvatiṃsa heaven.[27]

Brahmā also informs the Buddha of events of major significance. The monk Kokālika speaks ill of the friendship between Moggallāna and Sāriputta. He dies of a horrible disease and after death is reborn in the Paduma hell. It is Brahmā Sahampati who informs the Buddha of Kokālika's rebirth in hell (it is very unusual to have a monk assigned to hell).[28] The Brahmā Sahampati informs the Buddha of Devadatta's defection from the *saṃgha.* [29] It is left to Brahmā Sanaṃkumāra to proclaim the superiority of the *khattiya* class, to which the Buddha belonged, as the best among the people who put their trust in lineage

(*khattiyo seṭṭho jane tasmiṃ ye gottapaṭisārino*).[30]

In most cases of the Buddha-Brahmā conversations, the Brahmā salutes (*abhivādeti*) the Buddha and uses the term *bhante* to address him and stands. Some of the Brahmā gods are not keen on accepting the Buddha's superiority and they must be shown places. A certain Brahmā thought that no *samaṇa* or brāhmaṇa could come up to the Brahmā world. The Buddha, knowing that Brahmā's thoughts, appeared in the Brahmā world and seated himself cross-legged in the air above the Brahmā with flames radiating from his body.[31]

When the Buddha arrives at the Brahmā world, Baka Brahmā welcomes him with the term *mārisa.* The Buddha addresses him as *bho* Baka (*bho* is a term denoting equality and used among the brāhmaṇas) and not *āvuso.* Baka lost the arguments with the Buddha and wanted to disappear from the Brahmaloka, but was unable to do so as he planned (the implication is that before the superior power of the Buddha he could not have done so). But the Buddha vanishes from that place with ease.[32]

The Monks and the Gods

The gods watch over the activities of the monks and are at times represented as acting as their advisors, ever ready to admonish them if they ever transgress their rules of discipline. In the *Vinaya Sutta Vibhaṅga*, the monk Sudinna at the behest of his mother had intercourse with his former wife, as a result of which the latter conceived. The outcome was grave. The gods from the lowest to the highest orders, up to the Brahmā world, made a hue and cry, saying, "The *Bhikkhu saṃgha* is without morality." The Buddha having heard this criticism of the *devas* made it a major offence for the monks to engage in sexual intercourse, deserving expulsion from the order.[33] A monk who was staying among the Kosalas indulged in wrong and evil thoughts connected with worldly matters. Then a god (*devatā)* who inhabited that place was moved with compassion (*anukampikā)* for the monk. Desiring his welfare (*atthakāma*), he advises him to mend his ways.[34] A god (*devaputta*) named Jantu approaches the monks living in Kosala who were vain, unsteady, noisy, loose of speech

and uncontrolled in faculties. Jantu admonishes them to give up their ways.[35] In yet another instance a certain monk, who broke his fast, played in the lotus pond and sniffed the perfume of the red lotus, was admonished by a well intentioned god (*devatā)*, who said, "*Mārisa*, I will call you a smell thief (*gandhattheno mārisā ti).*"[36]

The gods, on the other hand, are engaged in persuading the monks to give up their life of hardship and rejoin their former world of ease and comfort. Such are probably devices to test the firmness of a monk's resolution to hold fast to his chosen path of freedom. A god (*devatā)* approaches the monk Samiddhi and, addressing him as *bhikkhu*, tells him that he is too young to give up the pleasures of life and that he should not give up the things of the present to pursue that which involves time.[37] Jālinī, a goddess, a messenger-woman (*dūtiyikā)* to the monk Anuruddha in a former birth, urges him to set his mind on the heavenly pleasures of the Tāvatiṃsa heaven, where he will be assured of being surrounded by beautiful daughters of gods (*devakaññā*). Jālinī herself was one of those living in Tāvatiṃsa (*Tāvatiṃsakāyikā devatā).*[38]

The gods, as we stated before, address the monks as *bhikkhu* and *mārisa.* Sometimes no salutation is indicated; they either stand or hover in mid-air and communicate with the monks. There are several other cases in which the gods are known to the monks personally or the gods themselves are of high rank and in turn communicate with monks of relatively high standing. The monks in such cases are addressed as *bhante* or *mārisa.*

Pāyāsi Rājā, for instance, dies and is reborn into the communion with the gods of Cātummahārāja. He meets with the monk Gāvampati. The god Pāyāsi salutes him (*abhivādeti)* and addresses him with the respectful *bhante* and in turn is addressed as *āvuso.*[39] It was relatively easy for the senior monks like Moggallāna to have access to the senior gods of Tāvatiṃsa and Brahmaloka. In a classic encounter with a Brahmā, Moggallāna, Anuruddha and Kappiṇa humble the Brahmā god by sitting above him in the Brahmā world. In their conversation, the Brahmā addresses Moggallāna as *mārisa* and in turn is called *āvuso.*[40] One Kakudha Koliyaputta is reborn as a god. He

visits Moggallāna, salutes, addresses him as *bhante* and stands. He informs Moggallāna that Devadatta is harbouring the thought that he will lead the order of the monks and with the rising of such a thought his psychic power has declined.[41] It is due to psychic ability that Moggallāna can, at will, visit Tāvatiṃsa world which has Sakka as its head. Once there he is received by Sakka accompanied by 500 gods. Sakka salutes and addresses Moggallāna with *mārisa.* Sakka also visits him on earth and, using a similar mode of address, salutes him. Moggallāna addresses him as *devānaṃ inda* (the chief of the gods), the title of Sakka and the term of reference used in the text to describe Sakka.[42]

The monks can theoretically reach the world of gods if they so wish and concentrate on achieving those objectives. In a famous episode, a monk went up to the realm of the Cātummahārāja gods and said to the gods there, "*Āvuso*, where do the four great elements, earth, water, fire and wind cease and leave no trace behind." They said that they did not know the answer but their four great kings, more potent and more glorious than they, would know the answer. The monk went to the four great kings and put the same question and was sent to the gods of Tāvatiṃsa heaven, the heaven superior to theirs. The Tāvatiṃsa gods sent him on to their Sakka, who also did not know the answer. In such a manner the monk went up the ladder in the heavens of other higher gods mentioned in a sequence until he reached the Brahmā gods, who unable to expound the question, in turn sent him to their chief god Mahābrahmā. Mahābrahmā told him to go back to the Buddha for the answer.[43]

The next best to the *nibbāṇa* for a monk is to be born as a Brahmā. In the *Dīgha Nikāya*, it is said that a *bhikkhu* who is free from anger and malice, pure in mind, in control of himself, would after death become one with the Brahmā (*Brahmuno sahavyūpago bhavissātī ti*).[44] A *bhikkhu* named Tissa, after death is reborn in the Brahmā world. The monk Moggallāna, vanishing from earth, actually visits Tissa, now a Brahmā god. Tissa welcomes him with salutation (*abhivādeti)* and addresses him as *mārisa.* Moggallāna addresses him as Tissa.[45] The god Brahmā Sahampati goes

to the Buddha, salutes him, addresses him as *bhante* and confesses that he was formerly a monk named Sahaka, and that by "cultivating the five faculties and by restraining sensual lust," he was reborn in the happy world after death in the Brahmā world and was called Brahmā Sahampati.[46]

The Gods and People in General

The good Buddhists, the *ariya sāvakas*, on account of their unwavering loyalty to the Buddha, *dhamma* and *saṃgha* , after death rise up to the world of gods. The gods (*devatās*) who had similar faith in the triad and experienced birth in the heavenly world, urge the other disciples by saying, "Come here in the company of the *devas*" (*ehi devānaṃ santike ti*).[47] The people who are believers in the Buddha and do good deeds, after death are reborn in heaven, or, if they live again among mankind, they are reborn in some rich family.[48] The men and women who are devout followers of the Buddha and who keep up the fasting (*uposatha*) with the eight precepts are reborn in heaven (*saggaṃ upenti)* without reproach.[49] An able and honest man who follows *dhamma* ends up being born in heaven.[50]

Giving in charity (*dāna*) is especially conducive to reaching heaven. By giving gifts to the future Buddha, a person was born seven times to the heavenly world (*sattakhattuṃ saggaṃ lokaṃ uppajji).*[51] The king Seri was a great giver of charity and was reborn as a *deva.*[52] But even among the close followers of the Buddha there is a distinction between the followers who practise the giving of charity (*dāna*) and those who does not. The followers alike in faith, virtue and insight, after death are reborn in the happy heaven (*suggatiṃ saggaṃ lokam*). But the *sāvaka* who is a giver, when he reaches the *deva* state (*devabhuto*) surpasses the non-giver god in five ways: in divine lifespan, beauty, happiness, honour and power.[53] Pāyāsi, a chieftain of Kosala, is reborn in the communion of the gods of Cātummahārāja, where as Uttara, his deputy, who gave *dāna* with unstinted heart, is reborn into the communion of Tāvatiṃsa gods (*devānaṃ Tāvatiṃsānaṃ*).[54] The *gahapati* Anāthapiṇḍika, the great donor and benefactor of the Buddhist order, is born in the Tusita heaven (higher than the *devas* of Tāvatiṃsa).[55]

Devahood can be won by consciously aspiring for it and fixing one's thought on attaining it. The disciple of the Buddha could be reborn in different heavens if he so desired. For example the disciple aspiring for life in Tāvatiṃsa heaven can achieve his desire by applying himself to attaining it; if he desires Brahmaloka it is also possible to be reborn in that heaven.[56] The daughter of the Sākya who was a great follower of the Buddha, his *dhamma* and *saṃgha* gave up a woman's thought and cultivated the thought of man, and after death was reborn in the company of the Tāvatiṃsa gods. The former Gopikā, the Sākyan girl, thus became Gopaka, a male god (*devaputta*) in that heaven.[57] The way to be reborn as god of fragrance is to practise good conduct in action and in thought. Also there is an added obligation to give charity, which should include the gift of scents and the offering of food and drink. The person then, after death, becomes one of the *devas* of fragrance.[58] The king Makhādeva develops the four Brahmā abodes (*brahmavihāras*) and after his death reaches the Brahmā world.[59]

A warrior (*yodhājīvo*) who exerts in battle and puts fourth efforts and dies in the performance of his duties, it is claimed, is born in the company of the *devas* of "passionate delight" (*sarañjitānaṃ devānaṃ sahavyataṃ upapajjatī).*[60] Similarly, an actor (*naṭa*) who makes people laugh and delights them by his action is reborn in the company of the "laughing *devas*" (*pahāsānaṃ devānaṃ*). The Buddha strongly disapproves of the reasoning that people, who, according to him, follow unethical professions, are reborn in heaven. However, Bimbisāra, the king of Magadha, becomes a god in the Cātummahārāja sphere of heaven. He meets with the Buddha as a god and says, "Deceased as a human king, I have become a non-human king in heaven (*amanussarājā divi homi).*"[61]

The *devas* have supernatural powers and remain unseen by the people in general, unless they are *samaṇas* and brāhmaṇas, like the Buddha and his monks and the brāhmaṇas like Mahāgovinda. The monk Ānanda asserts that the great king Pasenadi is not "even able to see the devas of the Tāvatiṃsa, let alone to banish them."[62] There are two cases in the texts in which the lay-followers of the

Buddha interact directly with the gods. The mother of Nanda, a meritorious Buddhist laywoman, has a face to face encounter with a god. Vessavana Mahārāja of the Cātummahārāja gods, going from the northern to the southern quarters on some business or other, heard Nandā's mother singing. Vessavana stopped and waited until the song ended. "Who is it," said Nanda's mother. "It is I, your brother," replies Vessavana. He then informs her of the arrival of the company of monks headed by Sāriputta. Sāriputta later complimented Nanda's mother, saying, "It is marvellous and wonderful that you should talk face to face with a *devaputta* ." Nanda's mother added that it was not unusual event, for, when her husband died, he rose among the *yakkhas* and "he, too, revealed himself in the old form."[63] Citta, the famous *gahapati* and a follower of the Buddha, once had an encounter with the gods of the forest, gardens and trees and when he was sick with a disease. He had a conversation with the gods but only his replies to the gods could be heard by his attendant, who thought that Citta was talking in his sleep due to delirium brought about by his sickness. Citta assures them that he did in fact talk with the gods. In the text Citta actually instructs the *devatās* to believe in the Buddha and his *dhamma.*[64]

Brahmā and Brāhmaṇas

There is a close affinity between the brāhmaṇas and the Brahmā gods. The brāhmaṇas, according to the *Dīgha Nikāya* , assert that they are of the best *vaṇṇa* and others are of lower grades. "Only a brāhmaṇa is of white *vaṇṇa* ; othėrs are black. Only the brāhmaṇas are of pure birth and not the others. Only the brāhmaṇas are legitimate sons of the god Brahmā, born out of his mouth, offspring of Brahmā, created by him and heirs of Brahmā."[65] The Buddha criticizes such brāhmaṇa claims to superiority and rejects them. It is said, as soon as Mahāgovinda brāhmaṇa arrived at a village, town or city, there he became as king to kings, as Brahmā to brāhmaṇas and a *devatā* to *gahapatis.*[66] The disciple of Mahāgovinda who had mastered his teaching in all their details, after death were reborn congenially in the world of Brahmā (*sugatiṃ*

***Brahmalokaṃ uppajjiṃsu*).[67] The reputation of Mahā-govinda was such that he conversed with the god Brahmā and held discussions with him. And in the text, we do find such a meeting of Mahāgovinda with a Brahmā god.[68] In the *Tevijja Sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya*, the aim of a brāhmaṇa is to seek for union with Brahmā (*Brahmuno sahavyūpago bhavissātī ti).*[69] The great brāhmaṇa teachers such as Pokkharasāti and Tārukkha are shown as imparting the correct teaching for reaching the state of union with Brahmā (*Brahma sahavyatāya*).[70] Out of the five types of brāhmaṇa, the Brahmā-like brāhamaṇa (*brāhmaṇo brahma-samo*) is the best one, superior to the *deva*-like (*deva-samo*). The brāhmaṇa becomes a Brahmā-like brāhmaṇa when he leads the Brahmā life of continence for 48 years, follows the practise of the four *Brahmavihāras* and after death is reborn in the Brahmaloka. The *deva*-like brāhmaṇa studies the Veda, marries a brāhmaṇa woman and after death is born as a *deva.*[71]

The dying wish of one brāhmaṇa Dhāñanjāni was to attain the Brahmaloka. The Buddha tells Sāriputta that the brāhmaṇa Dhāñanjāni had died and had actually risen to the Brahmaloka. In his conversation with the monk Sāriputta, Dhāñanjāni tells him that the Brahmaloka is the best form of life in the after world. Sāriputta then exclaims, "These brāhmaṇas are very intent on the Brahmā world" (*ime kho brāhmaṇa Brahmalokā adhimuttā).*[72] The brāhmaṇa Jāṇusoṇi says to the Buddha that wealth is the aim of a brāhmaṇa (*bhogādhippāyā*), *mantras* are his resolve (*mantādhiṭṭhānā),* sacrifice is his need (*yaññā-bhinivesā)* and the Brahmā world is is his ideal (*Brahma-loka aiyosānā).*[73]

The brāhmaṇas actually worship the Brahmā gods. A brāhmaṇa woman is shown as routinely making an oblation to Brahmā (*Brahmuno āhutiṃniccaṃ paggaṇhāti).* Her son's name is Brahmadeva. He had joined the *saṃgha* and had become an *arahat.* As the brāhmaṇa woman was offering her oblation, the Brahmā Sahampati manifested himself in her place. Standing in the sky (*vehāsaṃ ṭhito*), Sahampati told her to feed her own son, thereby making it a worthy gift useful for her future happiness. Brahmā Sahampati addresses the brāhmaṇa woman as *brāhmaṇi.*[74]

There is one instance of a dialogue between a brāhmaṇa and Brahmā. In the presence of the Brahmā Sanaṃkumāra, the brāhmaṇa Mahāgovinda addresses the Brahmā as *bhoto* (the plural of *bho*, a form used among the brāhmaṇas) and the Brahmā in turn addresses him as *mārisa.* [75]

The Gods and Gods

In the world of gods, that of the Brahmā with its Brahmā gods stands at the top of hierarchy. The hierarchy is described at several places in the texts. To begin with, the early Buddhist story of genesis informs us that when this world system begins to re-evolve, there appears the palace of Brahmā (*Brahmavimāna*). When this happens some being or other falls from the world of radiance and comes to live there. Other beings, too, fall from the world of radiance and appear in the palace of Brahmā as companions for him. The one who was first says: "I am Brahmā, the great Brahmā, the supreme one, the mighty, the all seeing, the ruler, the master of all, the maker, the creator, the chief of all, appointing each his place, the ancient of days, the father of all that are to be. These other beings are of my creation."[76] The Buddha would not like to give credence to the Brahmā's claims. Nevertheless, there is explicit recognition in the text as to the preeminent position of the Brahmā, the Brahmaloka and the Brahmā gods. In the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, it is stated that in the thousandfold system of the cosmos, which includes the worlds of Cātummahārāja gods, Tāvatiṃsa gods, Yāma gods, Tusita, Nimmāṇarati, Parinimmitavasavatti and Brahmaloka, the great Brahmā is reckoned as chief (*Mahābrahmā tattha aggaṃ akkhāyati).*[77]

The greatness of the *deva* species is measured in terms of length of the life span assigned to the gods. The underlying assumption is that in proportion to the higher life span in heaven, there is an increase in the enjoyment of happiness. In short, the longer the life continues in heaven, the better it is. Cātummahārāja *devas* have a life span of 9,000,000 years; *devas* of Tāvatiṃsa, 36,000,000; Yāma *devas*, 1444,000,000; Tusita *devas*, 576,000,000; Nimmāṇarati, 2,284,000,000; and Parinimmitavasavatti, 9, 216,000,000. The world of Brahmā, which is above the

others, is not mentioned in this passage.[78] Evidently, the life span of the Brahmā gods is incalculable. It is noteworthy that the discourse, in which the passage occurs, was given to Visākha Migāramātā, a woman lay devotee. One of the characteristics of the Brahmā world is that it is asexual. The Brahmās do not marry.

The Brahmaloka is the highest of the joyful worlds a person might attain.[79] A monk in search of the answer for his question regarding the four elements goes to various worlds of gods, starting with Cātummahārāja up to the last and the top Brahmā world. Even the chief of the Brahmā gods, the great Mahābrahmā, cannot answer the question and sends him back to the Buddha.[80] If a man should aspire for higher life after death, he has to concentrate on a higher form of life. He can attain a position in Cātummahārāja gods. But he will then be informed that better than the Cātummahārāja sphere, preferable is the sphere of the gods of Tāvatiṃsa. Thus progressively through the ranks of the spheres of other gods, mentioned in a sequence, he can aspire up to the Brahmaloka. But the Buddha adds that even the Brahmaloka is impermanent. A man should raise his mind above the Brahmaloka; he should fix it on cessation of the *āsavas.*[81] Although it is the ultimate aim of a Buddhist to destroy the *āsavas*, a monk who is free from anger and malice, pure in mind, master of himself, should after death, become united with Brahmā.[82] It is the belief of the brāhmaṇa Mahāgovinda that a mortal can reach the immortal Brahmaloka (*pappoti macco amataṃ Brahmalokaṃ ti).*[83] But as the Buddha says, the Brahmaloka is impermanent, not lasting (*Brahmaloko pi anicco*).[84]

The very moment a Buddha's disciple abides in the fourth stance of meditation, the earth *devas* utter a shout, "This one has destroyed the *āsavas.*" Hearing the utterance of the earth *devas*, the Cātummahārāja *devas* repeat it, as also the *devas* of Tāvatiṃsa, Yāma, Nimmāṇarati, Parinimmitavasavatti. The sound then soars up to the Brahmaloka.[85] The Dīgha Parajana *yakka* repeated it, as also the *devas* mentioned above in sequence. Thus the monks, Anuruddha, Nandiya and Kimbila became known as far as the Brahmā world.[86] The Buddha could make his voice

heard directly through to the Brahmaloka world system or even further if he chose.[87] The advantages of possessing psychic power (*iddhi*), according to the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*, are: one can handle and stroke with one's hand the moon and sun; being one, one becomes many, and finally one can control the body even to the Brahmā world.[88]

There are several other instances in which the world of the Brahmā gods emerge as being higher in rank than the other worlds of gods. When, for instance, the Brahmā Sanaṃkumāra appeared before the gods of Tāvatiṃsa, he outshone them in colour and glory, just as a figure of gold outshines the human frame. Rising up in the air Sanaṃkumāra sat cross-legged in the sky above the gods.[89] Sakka addresses the Brahmā Sanaṃkumāra as *Brahme*, and he in turn uses *devānaṃ inda*.[90] Sakka admits candidly that the god Brahmā is given respect by the gods.[91] The Brahmā world in the early Buddhist cosmogony is included in the *rūpa* (visible form of world), but below the invisible or incorporeal world (*arūpa*). The Brahmā world is above the Kāmāvacara *devaloka* consisting of the six *devalokas:* Cātummahārāja, Tāvatiṃsa, Yāma, Tusita, Nimmāṇarati, Parinimmitavasavatti, in ascending order. As T.W. Rhys Davids observes, "For practical ethical purposes the stress is laid on two places only (the Kāmāvacara *devaloka* and Brahmaloka)." [92]

Tāvatiṃsa had its own rewards to offer. One of the gods of the Tāvatiṃsa (*Tāvatiṃsakāyikā devatā)* is found wandering in Nandanavana (the garden of paradise), attended by a group of heavenly damsels (*accarā)*, supplied and provided with, and surrounded by heavenly sensuous enjoyments. He says, "Those who have not yet seen Nandanavana, the abode of manly *devas* (*naradevānaṃ āvāsaṃ*) have not experienced happiness."[93] The heaven of Tāvatiṃsa, with its Nandanavana, is considered an exclusive preserve of the gods belonging to that heaven, and any unwanted intrusion is resented. In one instance, a certain man of Rājagaha who was poor, destitute and of no account, became an ardent follower of the Buddha and his *dhamma.* He understood the *dhamma* in its true perspective. As a result, he was reborn after death in the world of happiness and light in the community of the

Tāvatiṃsa gods. He, however, outshone the other gods in that heaven in beauty and prominence. Thereupon the gods of the Tāvatiṃsa became vexed and worried, and were consumed with anger at this strange and unheard of event, that a poor pauper of no account, reborn from the world of men, should outshine them.[94]

In another example, a certain *yakkha*, an ugly and potbellied dwarf, came to be seated on the throne of Sakka, the ruler of the Tāvatiṃsa gods. At this sight, the gods of Tāvatiṃsa became annoyed, angry at this strange and unheard of procedure. Now in proportion as they became annoyed, that *yakkha* grew even more handsome and more presentable and more attractive. The gods then approached Sakka and told him what had happened. Then Sakka came up to the *yakkha* and draping his robe over one shoulder, and kneeling on his right knee reached forth his joined hands towards the *yakkha* announcing his name thrice. In proportion as Sakka did this that *yakkha* became more ill favoured and dwarfed and potbellied, till he vanished then and there. Sakka then took his seat on his throne.[95]

The Cātummahārāja *devas*, however, have access to the assembly of the Tāvatiṃsa. Their position is that of deputies to the Tāvatiṃsa gods. They guard at the same time the four quarters of the earth. In the *Aṅguttara*, it is said that on the fifteenth day, the Cātummahārāja gods in person perambulate the world of humans to see whether the people pay reverence to mother or father, to *samaṇas* and brāhmaṇas, show deference to the leader of the lineage, and observe fasting. They report the matter to the gods of Tāvatiṃsa, as they sit in conclave in the Sudhamma Hall. The Cātummahārājas, in their report before the assembly of the Tāvatiṃsa gods, address them as *mārisa*.[96] In another instance, Vessavana, one of the gods of the Cātummahārāja world, informs Sakka about the presence of the monk Uttara in Dhvajalikā. Sakka goes down to earth and pays his respect to Uttara.[97]

Even among the gods of the Tāvatiṃsa there is a distinction. As the gods of the Tāvatiṃsa were seated in the Sudhamma hall, those gods who had been recently born as members of the Tāvatiṃsa fraternity, because they had lived a higher life under the Buddha, outshone the other

gods in appearance and glory.[98] The missionary bias of the compilers of the texts is obvious in this case.

The chief of the Tāvatiṃsa gods, Sakka, addresses the gods of that world with the term *mārisa*, they reciprocate by using the same term, although salutation is indicated in the text.[99] Within the palace of Sakka even his female attendants (*paricārikāyo*) address Sakka with the term *mārisa*.[100] When a battle is raging between the gods and the demons (*asura*), Sakka addresses the gods as *mārisa* and encourages them to fight on.[101] Similarly, when the *asuras* and *devas* are massed for a battle, Vepacitti, the chief of the *asuras* addresses the *asuras* as *mārisa*.[102] Interestingly enough, Sakka addresses his enemy Vepacitti of the *asuras* as *mārisa* and receives the same mode of address from him.[103] The mode of address undergoes a change with respect to the charioteer of Sakka, Mātali, who is addressed by Sakka as *samma Mātali* (*samma*, a term of address between friends) but receives *bhaddanta* from Mātali.[104] Sakka sends Suvīra *devaputta* on an important errand to the *asura* camp and addresses him as *tāta Suvīra* (*tāta*, a term of address indicating close and affectionate relationship as that between father and son) and receives *bhaddanta*.[105]

In the world of the Brahmās, the Pacceka Brahmā Suddhavāso and Subrahmā address each other with the term *mārisa*, and in their conversation with another Brahmā god they use the same term.[106] The great Brahmā says to one of the Brahmās in his retinue (*Brahma-pārisajja*) that he should approach the monk Moggallāna, Kassapa, Kappiṇa and Anuruddha. He addresses the Brahmā as *mārisa*. The Brahmā messenger goes to Moggallāna at the bidding of the Brahmā. Having received a satisfactory reply from Moggallāna, the Brahmā once again goes to Mahābrahmā, the chief of the Brahmā gods and; addressing him as *mārisa*, tells him what had transpired between him and Moggallāna.[107]

Observations and Concluding Remarks

The texts explicitly describe the high rank of the Brahmaloka with its Brahmā gods and the great Brahmā. The Brahmaloka is higher than the Kāmāvacaraloka. For example, the life span of the gods is a good measure of their standing; one experiences relatively more happiness if one has more years to lead a happy existence in the heaven above. The gods are made to admit that as one goes upwards to the Brahmā world one encounters gods more potent and glorious than the previous ones. The Brahmā gods literally outshine the gods of Tāvatiṃsa. The Buddha apparently acknowledges the existence of the gods and the ranked hierarchy embedded in their worlds. He, however, excels all other gods in rank; he is above them. The Buddha surely has a supernatural aura about him. The logic of the compilers is simple. As they wanted to assert the Buddha's superior rank over the gods, they had to admit the gods' hierarchical structure. You cannot have one without the other. Nothing could have pleased the compilers of the texts more than to place the Buddha, and even some of his more famous monks, such as Moggallāna and Anuruddha, above the highly placed Brahmā gods.

The psychic power (*iddhi)* attributed to the Buddha and his famous monk Moggallāna makes it possible for them to reach the world of the high gods whom they are shown as visiting freely as occasion demanded. "A Tathāgata, like an iron ball, if heated all day long, is lighter and softer, more plastic and radiant; so is the mind of a Tathāgata. After intense mental repose he attains the state of buoyancy."[108] The Buddha then can at will reach the Brahmā and Tāvatiṃsa worlds and hold conversations with gods residing there. The high gods of the same worlds come to visit the Buddha in the world of humans. These high gods do not visit the ordinary monks or brāhamaṇas. In fact a lesser god expresses a concern that, since the Buddha is surrounded by high gods, he may not have the opportunity to meet with the Buddha.

There is a correlation between the significant events in the Buddha's career and the presence of high gods. The high god Brahmā is present in one of the most important

events in the Buddha's career; it was at Brahmā's request that he decided to tell others of his newly discovered *magga*. When the Buddha is displeased with the newly ordained monks, it is Brahmā who begs him to have mercy on them. His first discourse reaches the Brahmaloka in a split second. The god Brahmā informs the Buddha of Devadatta's defection from the *saṃgha*. When the Buddha dies it is Brahmā, followed by Sakka, who announces that event. The lesser gods are brought on to inform the Buddha of events which are of significance to his mission. Conversely, the Buddha spreads some of his ideas through the medium of the gods. Our evidence associates the presence of high or low gods with order and purpose, not chance or chaos. The Buddha's greatness is thus legitimised through the world of the gods.

No god can control the Buddha and admonish him. But the gods are in a position to guide the monks. They watch over their welfare and, at times, admonish them. They test the virtues of the monks' resolution as celibate beings in search of higher truths. If the monks cannot destroy the *āsavas*, they can strive for the next best goal of being born into a community of the Brahmā gods. Brahmā Sahampati, for instance, admits that he was a monk in his previous life.

The Buddhists offer the incentive of birth in the happy heaven as gods to their dutiful laymen and laywomen who practise virtues such as making charitable donations. The former devout laypersons, *ariya sāvakas*, like Anāthapiṇḍika, are born in heaven. But one must give charity with real commitment. Pāyāsi's half-hearted approach gave him a place in the realm of Cātummahārāja gods, whereas his assistant Uttara is born in the higher heaven of Tāvatiṃsa.

That the Brahmā gods were the gods of the brāhamanas is amply demonstrated in the texts. The brāhamaṇas claim descent from Brahmā, and their ultimate goal is to be born into the community of Brahmaloka, that is, to reach a state of union with the Brahmā gods, in short to become Brahmās. The brāhmaṇa Jāṇussoṇi dies and is reborn in the Brahmaloka. The Brahmā-brāhmaṇa relationship was so close that it was crystalized in a statement made of

Mahāgovinda's widespread reputation that "he became as king to kings, as Brahmā to brāhmaṇas, as a *devatā* to *gahapatis*." Mahāgovinda had a face to face encounter with Brahma Sanaṃkumāra. And a brāhmaṇa woman offers an oblation of food on a regular basis to the Brahmā.

The Brahmā gods of the brāhmaṇas were the highest gods in the *rūpa* world, which is above the Kāmāvacaraloka. The Bodhisattas and monks are reborn in the Brahmaloka. As stated before, the next best thing to *nibbāṇa* for a monk is to be born into the Brahmā world. The mental states of higher meditation are called *Brahmavihāras*. One of the characteristics of the god Brahmā is that he is asexual.[109] This notion translated at the social level would fit in with the concept of a higher life of sexual abstinence for the monks and the desire not to perpetuate the family (and the cycle of life and death).[110]

As mentioned in the last chapter, in the social and political arena the Buddha challenged the brāhmaṇas' ideas of social superiority based on birth. The brāhamaṇas maintained a hostile equality with the Buddha which is expressed in their use of the term *bho Gotama*. Unless the brāhmaṇas were formally converted to the Buddha's views and became monks, they continued to address the Buddha with *bho Gotama*. *Bho*, as we pointed out earlier, was a courteous mode of address which they used among themselves. In the world of the gods, the Brahmā gods (*Brahmakāyikā devas*) were the high gods above those in the Tāvatiṃsa heaven. The Buddha denied the claims of superiority of the brāhmaṇa class, yet accepted the high status of the Brahmā gods in heaven. On the other hand he had raised himself above the Brahmā gods since those gods had acknowledged his superior position.

This chapter reveals the order within the *deva* world and the connection between social structure and group ideology. The ranked hierarchy of the gods of the lower Kāmāvacaraloka and the higher Brahmaloka has been clearly stated. To reiterate the obvious, Cātummahārāja gods were the lowest rung of Kāmāvacaraloka and the Brahmā gods were the highest in ranking in the *rūpa* world. Judging from the evidence presented in this chapter, one is inclined to believe that the worship or reverence attached to a

particular kind of high god emerges out of experience with a type of persisting socio-political group whose area of jurisdiction corresponds to that attributed to the gods. The close proximity of the brāhmaṇas as a high ranking ritual group to the Brahmā gods with Brahmaloka is an example in point.

The Tāvatiṃsa gods with Sakka as their chief, in all likelihood, were associated with the ruling extended kin-groups like the Sākyas, Koḷiyas, Licchavis, Mallas etc. Gopikā the Sākyan girl became Gopaka a male god in the Tāvatiṃsa heaven. Ajita, the Licchavi general, is reborn in the Tāvatiṃsa. The monk Anuruddha's (a Sākyan by birth) former messenger woman tempts him to come to Tāvatiṃsa. The Tāvatiṃsa heaven has a Sudhamma Hall where the gods assemble to discuss matters of mutual interest. The presence of intruders and strangers is resented in Tāvatiṃsa when the party happens to be a poor man from the city of Rājagaha or a potbellied *yakkha*. One is reminded of the *Dīgha Nikāya* episode of the brāhamaṇa Ambaṭṭha's discomfiture when he was ignored and insulted by the Sākyas seated in the Santhāgāra, their assembly hall.[111] Rhys David aptly observes: "Sakka [the ruler of the Tāvatiṃsa] is no absolute monarch. He is imagined in the likeness of a chieftain of a Kosala clan."[112] On the negative side, there is no evidence that the brāhmaṇas ever worshipped the god Sakka. The king Bimbisāra was reborn in the Cātummahārāja world, and Anāthapiṇḍika in the Tusita heaven.

The term *mārisa* is the most frequently used term among the gods and connotes the principle of equality between the speaker and the addressee. Sakka uses this term for his fellow inmates in the Sudhamma Hall and the gods of the Tāvatiṃsa reciprocate with *mārisa*. This mode of address is repeatedly used by Sakka to address the Tāvatiṃsa gods elsewhere. Sakka makes use of the term *mārisa* to address the monks and the Buddha. But his preferred term of address to the Buddha is *bhante* thereby acknowledging the Buddha's higher rank. Sakka even uses *mārisa* to address his enemy Vepacitti, who in turn uses a similar mode of address. Sakka would use either *samma* or *tāta* , the terms of affection and trust, for his assistants who are very close

to him, such as his personal charioteer and one of his "sons." But he will receive from them *bhaddanta* (not to be confused with *bhante*), a form of address indicating father-son relationship or employee-employer relationship based on mutual love and respect. The Brahmā gods use the term *mārisa* to address each other and their chief Mahābrahmā. The gods of lower status, too, would use *mārisa* to address the monks and the Buddha. But generally they are given to using *bhante* to address the Buddha and senior monks. In the world of humans, the term *mārisa* is used by the king Pasenadi of Kosala to address his five chieftain-allies (*rājās*) and receives from them the same mode of address.[113] The term *mārisa*, thus, expresses the principle of solidarity within the group and also denotes equality of rank.

The monks use *āvuso* to address each other[114] and the others, including the gods and the *paribbājakas.*[115] A differential mode of address was introduced later to solidify the internal organization of the *saṃgha.* The term *bhante* was to be used for senior monks by the juniors,[116] and *āvuso* among monks of equal rank. The monks address the Buddha with the respectful *bhante Bhagavā.*[117] The brāhmaṇas use *bho* to address each other[118] and others with whom they are prepared to deal on terms of equality. The example in point is their use of *bho* for the Buddha and the monks.[119] The brāhmaṇas also use *bho*[120] for the *paribbājakas.*

The three terms *mārisa, āvuso* and *bho* are thus modes of address used within the groups; gods, Buddhists and brāhmaṇas and *paribbājakas* having a shared perception of equality. When the above terms are used as modes of address for those groups extraneous to their own, it indicates the extension of the concept of solidarity-equality to other groups so addressed. For example, the brāhamaṇas use *bho* among themselves; they use it for the Buddha, his monks and other *paribbājakas.* The Brahmā gods use *mārisa* to address each other. The gods of Tāvatiṃsa, too, use the term in an identical manner. The monks use the term *āvuso* to address each other and the gods. The Buddha uses the term *āvuso* to the gods. The gods use *mārisa* to address the Buddha and his monks.

The term *bhante* represents a power relation which is asymmetrical or non-reciprocal. That is a person of inferior status (servant, employee, student, junior, assistant etc.) can use the term *bhante* to his superior (master, employer, teacher, preceptor, elder etc.), but the latter cannot use the same term. As stated earlier the monks use *bhante* to address the Buddha. The high and low gods who are converted to the Buddha's teachings address the Buddha with *bhante*. In the secular world of the *Nikāya* texts, a door keeper, a messenger,[121] a servant,[122] a watchman,[123] and a bath attendant address their employers-masters as *bhante*.[124] There appears to be an element of incongruity between the use of the solidarity address among the gods and their ascriptive hierarchical rank. That is, although the worlds of the gods are sharply divided into hierarchical rank (e.g., Brahmaloka is higher than Kāmāvacaraloka), the modes of address used among the gods essentially connote a solidarity relationship, where one would expect to find the modes of address of power indicating an asymmetrical relationship. One should expect to find in the texts, for instance, the Tāvatiṃsa gods (who are manifestly inferior to the Brahmā gods) addressing the Brahmā gods with *bhante*. But they do not do so. They use instead *mārisa*, an address of solidarity–equality.

The ideology of the compilers of the *Nikāya* texts seems to have played a role in their disapproval of barriers which might exist among the groups of unequal rank. In other words, the *Nikāya* compilers refuse to project, in the world of the gods, the social reality based on hierarchical rank. *Devaloka*, for the Buddhists, is accessible to all through the acquisition of meritorious *kamma*. The gods themselves have no special powers to alter *kamma* formations. Any of the *ariya sāvakas*, or a *bhikkhu*, can reach any of the places of Kāmāvacaraloka or Brahmaloka. The early Buddhists offer a promise of heaven to a pious and charitable Buddhist lay person. A poor man has access to the Tāvatiṃsa. The followers of the Buddha who are newly born in the Tāvatiṃsa heaven can outshine the older Tāvatiṃsa gods because of extra merit acquired as the imbibers of the Buddha's teachings. The cosmos (and the cosmic gods) which the early Buddhists inherited from

their predecessors, was established on the principle of hierarchy and rank. The ascriptive or received hierarchical rank of the gods is abundantly brought forth in the texts. But the ideological orientation of the Buddha and his monks was to perceive the cosmos as an open system.

Summing up, with regard to the society of humans in our texts, we find a two dimensional view of society: horizontal solidarity indicating equality of similar status groups and vertically ranked hierarchy indicating differentiated social classes. There is a competition between classes. The Buddha and his *bhikkhus* want to project a horizontal undifferentiated society of gods. They do so by deliberately effacing the "linguistic barriers" (modes of address) which delineate the existence of the ranked aspect of the world of the gods. The world of the gods was to be like the world of the Buddhist *saṃgha*, essentially classless.

Chapter V
Kinship, Marriage and Social Organization

Introduction

THE recognition that the study of kinship is an important aspect of Indian social history goes as far back as Sir Henry Maine. He and many others after him have studied various elements of kinship in India, such as *gotta*, caste, clanship, the institution of marriage and so on for different periods of history. These historians studied these elements each one isolated from the other. Some times they attempted to establish the presence of a particular element or its types at a given time. At others they studied particular elements over a long period and attempted to demonstrate social change over the period. They also studied the ritual, economic and political concomitants of these elements but in a more generalised setting. More modestly, in the course of their preoccupation with other aspects of history they provided data covering their own period which contributed to some current controversy about the existence or nature of some elements of kinship. Important as these studies are, they do not illustrate, if one might use the term, the more detailed structure of a particular region of Indian society in a given period and its functioning.

We propose to study the kinship and marriage as reflected in the Pāli texts, not as various elements but as a system, that is, in the manner in which it is studied by the present day social anthropologists. The meaning of this contention will be clear from the following remarks of Radcliffe-Brown. He writes:[1]

> A system of kinship and marriage can be looked at as an arrangement which enables persons to live together and cooperate with one another in an orderly social life. For any particular system as it exists at a certain time we can make a study of how it works. To do this

we have to consider how it links persons together by convergence of interest and sentiment and how it controls and limits those conflicts that are always possible as the result of divergence of sentiment or interest. In reference to any feature of a system we can ask how it contributes to the working of the system. This is what is meant by speaking of its social function. When we succeed in discovering the function of a particular custom, i.e. the part it plays in the working of the system to which it belongs, we reach an understanding or explanation of how it came into existence. This kind of understanding of kinship system as a working system linking human beings together in an orderly arrangements of interactions, by which particular customs are seen as functioning parts of the social machinery, is what is aimed at in synchronic analytic study. In such an analysis we are dealing with a system as it exists at a certain time, abstracting as far as possible from any changes that it may be undergoing. To understand a process of change we must make a diachronic study. But to do this, we must first learn all that we possibly can about how the system functioned before the changes that we are investigating occurred. Only then we learn something of their possible causes and see something of their actual or probable effects. It is only when changes are seen as changes in or of a functioning system that they can be understood.

Of the treatment of kinship by some historians, A.R. Radcliffe-Brown has the following to say:

> The literature dealing with kinship is loaded with theories that can only be described as pseudo-historical. There are many varieties of such theories, but they all have one thing in common. Starting from known condition in the present or in the historically recorded past, an "explanation" of it is invented by imagining some condition or event in the unrecorded past and arguing on a *a priori* grounds that the known condition might or must have had its origin in this way. The devotion to pseudo-history has had unfortunate results. It has led to the adoption of false ideas about the facts

as they are, and has often influenced or vitiated observation and description.

But we have nothing to lose by applying the anthropological technique to our datable historical material in an attempt to study the contemporary structure of society without, however, theorising on earlier antiquity. To quote Radcliffe-Brown again:

> The reality of a kinship system as a part of social structure consists of the actual social relations of person to person as exhibited in their interactions and their behaviour in respect of one another. But the actual behaviour of two persons in a certain relationship (father and son, husband and wife, or mother's brother and sister's son) varies from one particular instance to another. What we have to seek in the study of a kinship system are the norms. Actual observations of the way persons do behave will enable us to discover the extent to which they conform to the rules and kinds and amount of deviation.[2]
>
> A kinship system thus presents to us a complex set of norms, of usages, of patterns of behaviour between kindred. Deviations from the norm have their importance. Where there is marked divergence between ideal or expected behaviour in the actual conduct of many individuals this is an indication of disequilibrium; for example; when the rule is that a son should obey his father but there are notably frequent instances of disobedience.[3]

The main import of these lengthy quotations is that we should study kinship and marriage in their own right as functioning wholes in which the persons are related by convergence of sentiment and interest. The contents of these wholes are: 1. Various interpersonal relationships comprising normative and actual behaviour. 2. Institution of marriage. 3. The various kinship groups which we can derive and the principles of such groupings. 4. The intergroup organization. We shall deal with these in this chapter.

An additional point that Radcliffe-Brown makes is that

an analytical study of the type he proposes must necessarily be synchronic and the social change can be dealt with only at the end of such a study. What is more important is that there should be no *a priori* assumptions of conditions previous in time from which the present conditions should be derived.

Interpersonal Relationships Among Relative –Stereotypes and Actual Behaviour

Parents and Sons

The term for mother and father in Pāli is *Mātā-Pitā*. The relationship between parent and son is that of love and affection. Describing a son's attitude to his parents, the Buddha says, "Parents cannot be repaid even if a son should provide them with all physical care and comforts that may need and also earn. for them all the power and riches on earth; this is because the parents bring their children into being and nourish them."[4] "Parents are like Brahmā; they are the ancient teachers, they are worthy of gifts. The wise worship them, honour them and satisfy their material needs, for they are compassionate to their children."[5] Of the six quarters, the parents are represented by the east, hence a son should support them, fulfil the duties which he inherits from his father; continue the lineage, be worthy of inheritance and pay homage to the ancestors.[6]

However, only some persons behave towards their father in this ideal manner. On the one hand, we find persons who behave ideally. The brāhmaṇa Dhānañjāni, exploits the king and the *gahapatis* playing them off against each other in order to support his parents and family.[7] Ghaṭikāra, the potter, supports his blind parents and family.[8] Another brāhmaṇa is nicknamed "supporter of his mother (*mātu-posako*)" because he maintains his parents by begging. The Buddha approves of him and says that he will go to heaven because of this.[9] Sudinna Kalandaka, even after he has become a monk, succumbs to the plea by his mother that he should fulfil his duty towards her and his father by providing a son in order to continue the lineage.[10] The doctor Jīvaka presents his substantial first earnings to his

foster father, prince Abhaya, in gratitude for having him brought up.[11] On the other hand we find Ajātasattu who admits before the Buddha that he had killed his father Bimbisāra, a righteous man, for the sake of throne.[12] The brāhmaṇa Mānatthadda respects neither his parents nor his elder brother.[13] The action of the *upāsaka* who presented a store room to a group of nuns is challenged by his faithless son in a court after his death.[14] When the Buddha sees a rich brāhmaṇa looking worn out and dressed, and inquires about his state, he says that it is his four sons and their wives who have driven him out of the house.[15] Rāhula instigated by his mother addresses the Buddha (his father) as *samaṇa*, a term of indifference rather than affection, and asks for his inheritance.[16]

Ideally the parents desire a son to be born in the family because he will add to the possessions, perform the family duties, perpetuate the lineage, transmit the inheritance to his sons in turn and pay homage to the ancestors.[17] The parents also restrain a son from vice and exhort him to virtue, train him in a profession, marry him suitably, and hand him over his inheritance in due time.[18]

In practise we find that the parents have deep love and affection for their sons. Aggika *Jaṭila*, a mendicant, out of affection addresses the foundling he brought up as *tāta*; while the child addresses him as *pitā* (father).[19] Yasa, the son of a *seṭṭhi gahapati*, Anuruddha and the Buddha, are all supported in great luxury by their parents. According to a stock formula repeated in each case, they are given three mansions each for a different season and many women to serve them.[20] Soṇa Kolīvisa, another son of a *seṭṭhi* is so delicately nurtured "that hair grew on the soles of his feet." When the king sends for Soṇa, his parents send him in a palanquin.[21] Upāli's parents want to choose a suitable profession for him, so that he may live at ease after their death. They reject scribing (*lekhana*) lest it may pain his fingers, counting (*gaṇana*) because it may hurt his chest, and money changing (*rupaṃ*) because it may weaken his eyes. Finally they choose monkhood for their son, because the monks live at ease, eat good meals, and take a siesta sheltered from the wind after the meals.[22]

A *gahapati* is so grieved at the death of his son that he

stops eating, leaves his business and often visits the funeral ground shouting for him.[23] When Raṭṭhapāla wishes to join the order, his parents seek to stop him, by saying,"you are our only child, dear, beloved, you live in comfort. You are well cared for and you do not know suffering. Eat, drink and amuse yourself. You can do meritorious deeds and enjoy the pleasures of senses at the same time. If you were to die, we would become desolate. How could we then let you go when you are still alive."[24] The friends of Raṭṭhapāla intervene at the instance of the parents but fail. In the end, the parents give in on the condition that Raṭṭhapāla should visit them after he becomes a monk.[25] When Sudinna Kalandaka wants to become a monk, his parents also seek to stop him in a similar way.[26] When Yasa leaves his house secretly, it is his mother who notices his absence first. Later, the *seṭṭhi gahapati*, Yasa's father, while pleading with him says, "Your mother is full of grief and laments. Give life back to your mother."[27] In the *Aṅguttara* , it is said that a mother cannot bear to see her son grow old. She says, "I am growing old; let not my son grow old." The son likewise cannot bear to see his mother grow old.[28] When the Buddha leaves home, his parents have faces "with tears caused by crying."[29] Suddhodana Sākya, the Buddha's father, requests him to make a rule that a son cannot join the order without his parents' consent. Describing his own feelings he says, "When you (Buddha) went forth there was great sorrow, the same happened when Nanda did so. But when Rāhula went it was extreme. The affection for a son is deeply set in the body. It cuts to the marrow and it goes deep in the bones."[30]

In contrast to this melodramatic expression of affection towards the son, we find the Buddha advising the brāhmaṇa Mahāsāla who was driven out of the house by his sons, to shame them in public. Accordingly the brāhmaṇa recites a verse taught by the Buddha, in a public hall. He says: "He (the father) was glad at the birth of sons while they [the sons] in concert with their wives drove him out of the house. These sons are shameless and impious. They call him *tāta* but really they are the demons in the guise of sons. They do not care for an old man just as they do not care for a horse. So they leave him in the lurch. He is their

father, the senior of his children. Yet he begs at others' doors." The sons are duly ashamed when they hear this, and they clothe him anew and respect him.[31]

Among the family responsibilities of a son, that of maintaining the family lineage is very important. In the instance of Sudinna Kalandaka, we see concern with the continuation of the lineage.[32] In addition, the Buddha is accused of making families (*kula*) sonless (*apputtakatāya*) and thereby destroying them.[33]

The succession to office is from father to the son. Ajātasattu kills his father Bimbisāra in order to succeed him on his throne.[34] Inheritance is an important aspect of parent-son relationship. The property of both the mother and the father goes to their son, but where there is none, the property goes either to the next of kin or to the state. Thus Sudinna Kalandaka's mother, in persuading her son who has become a monk to give them a child, argues that if he does not provide a son the property would go to the Licchavis.[35] Raṭṭhapāla as well as Sudinna are tempted by the offers of the wealth of their fathers, mothers and their paternal grandfathers.[36] Suddhodana Sākya is extremely pained at the ordination of Rāhula, his son's son, presumably because he has no heir left after him.[37] The property of a *seṭṭhi gahapati* who dies intestate is confiscated by King Pasenadi.[38] The importance of inheritance is demonstrated by the Buddha, who explains this happening by saying that in the previous life the intestate *gahapti* had killed his brother's only son for the sake of property.[39] That the inheritance was divided equally between all sons can be seen in the case of a brāhmaṇa who dies leaving a son by one of his two wives. When the other wife is pregnant the son goes to his mother's co-wife (*mātu sapattiṃ*) and asks her to hand over the property. He says: "Whatever wealth there is, is mine. There is nothing here for you whatever; make over to me the inheritance of my father." She, however, replies, "Wait till a child is born to me; if it is a son he will share the property with you equally, if a girl she shall wait on you."[40] Hence it appears that both wife and daughter are excluded from inheritance which is patrilineal. It is natural, therefore, that we find King Pasenadi sad when a daughter is born to him instead of a son.[41]

Property can be transferred in the life time of the father. Thus, *gahapati* Poṭaliya has handed over the inheritance to his sons as befitting one who is concerned with spiritual affairs. He is no longer concerned with advising his sons.[42] A *gahapati* of Vesāli gives property to his sister's son in preference to his own. He asks the monk Ajjuka to ascertain which of the two has faith and belief (in the Buddha). Ajjuka decides in favour of the sister's son, to the annoyance of the *gahapati's* own son.[43] The latter appeals to the monk Ānanda and asks rhetoricaily, "Who is the father's heir (*pituno dāyājo*), the son or the sister's son? " Ānanda replies that the son is the heir to the father. Then the son of the *gahapati* blames the monk Ajjuka. In a final appeal, the monk Upāli, while silent on the question of inheritance, confirms that the monk Ajjuka is right in siding with the one who has faith.[44]

The last factor is the ancestor worship which consists of paying homage to the ancestors by the son. Thus, when the parents are dead, among other things, the son has to make offering to the ancestors.[45] The son (*kulaputta*) has also to give a share (*bali*) of his hard-earned wealth to ancestors (*pubbapeta*).[46]

Father-Mother and Daughters

Daughters are the responsibility of the parents; like sons, daughters also need to seek permission of their parents in order to become nuns.[47] Daughters are protected by their parents (*māturakkhitā pitūrakkhitā and mātāpitaro rakkhitā*).[48] At proper age they are married to suitable husbands and sent to their new homes.[49] Sometimes widowed daughters come back and reside with their parents. Thus a poor Bhāradvāja brāhmaṇa, among other things, is encumbered by the presence of his seven daughters. All his daughters are widows, each with one or two issues. The section concerning this brāhmaṇa itself is subtitled "*bahudhiti*" i.e. concerning many daughters.[50]

There is a close tie of affection between a mother and her daughter. A girl Kāṇā who returns on a visit to her parents' home is referred to as going to her mother's house (*mātughara*) and not her father's.[51] In the *Vinaya* another woman who quarrels with her husband also goes to her

mother's house (*mātughara*).[52] A former courtesan is unwilling to give her beautiful daughter in marriage to strangers from a distant village, but does so on the intervention of the monk Udāyi. When the daughter complains to her that her husband's household treats her harshly, the mother goes to her daughter's house to plead with the latter's husband and his parents.[53] It must be noted, however, that in this case the mother being a courtesan had to assume the role of a father as well as a mother.

We have seen that the father prefers a son to a daughter and also that she does not inherit her father's property if he has a son.[54] A father's attitude to his daughter is described by the Buddha when he consoles Pasenadi, who is disappointed by the birth of a daughter. The Buddha says: "A female child may prove an even better offspring than a male one. For she may grow up wise and virtuous. She will honour her mother-in-law (*sassudevā*) and be faithful to her husband (*patibbatā*). The boy that she may bear may do great deeds.[55] In Buddha's words we also see the ideal of behaviour for daughters and wives.

A woman must please her parents. Thus the enamoured and lustful monks implore a woman to consent to their wishes by saying, "When will your mother be reconciled? When will your father be reconciled?" [56]

Brother and Brother

The elder brother commands respect from his younger brother. In this respect he is next to the parents. Thus, the brāhmaṇa Mānatthaddha neglects to respect not only his parents but also his elder brother (*jeṭṭha bhātara*).[57] The elder brother reciprocates this behaviour by exercising authority and by caring for the younger brother. Mahānāma Sākya, on the death of his father, looks after the property and keeps his brother Anuruddha in luxury, so that the latter does not know how to replace his brother when he desires to become a monk.[58] We may also note that Yasa and Raṭṭhapāla, who are described as living in luxury, are mentioned thus by their parents.[59]

Sometimes brothers are mentioned together without indicating the difference of age between them. They are also shown as following the same occupation. This suggests the

solidarity of the brothers in their relationship with others. Puraṇa and Isidatta are both architects (*thāpati*).[60] Yemeḷu and Tekula, the two brāhmaṇa brothers, approach the Buddha with the suggestion that the latter should introduce a metre (*chanda*) to preach the *dhamma.*[61] Two farmer brothers lie dead with their oxen, while the Buddha is meditating nearby.[62] The two *Jaṭila* brothers, who are fire worshippers, follow the example of their elder brother in giving up the fire worship and joining the Buddhist *saṃgha.*[63]

The brothers share their father's property. Thus a brāhmaṇa woman who is pregnant at the time of her husband's death, asks her step-son to wait till her child is born. "If he is a boy,"she says, "he will take half the share."[64] The "half share" indicates an equal share. An *upāsaka* presented a storeroom to a group of nuns in his life time. His unfaithful son says to his faithful brother after the *upāsaka's* death, "Let us divide (*bhājāma*) the property, the storeroom is ours."[65] Suddhodana Sākya, who is grieved at the Buddha's going forth, is equally grieved at Nanda going forth, presumably because he has lost both his heirs.[66]

Sometimes, the inheritance passes from one brother to another or from the son of brother to another brother. Thus, the King of the Sākyas, Bhaddiya puts off going forth until he transfers the management of his estate to his sons and brothers.[67] A *seṭṭhi* dies without an heir, because he had in previous birth killed his brother's only son for the sake of property.[68]

Sister-Sister

In describing a "sister-like wife" the Buddha says, "Like the respect which a sister gives to the elder sister (*jeṭṭha bhaginī*), a "sister-like wife" respects her husband. Acting meekly she serves her husband's every wish."[69] Hence it is obvious that the elder sister was respected.

Solidarity between sisters is shown by the fact that Mahāpajāpati and her sister Māyā, the Buddha's mother, were both married to Suddhodana Sākya.[70] Moreover, it is Mahāpajāpati who serves the Buddha as his mother's sister, nurse and foster mother.[71]

Brother and Sister

The term of address and reference for a sister is *bhaginī*. It is also used in a classificatory sense by the monks, who address all women as sisters. Since the monks should avoid all sexual relationships with women, this usage indicates that such relationships were prohibited between brother and sister. We find further proof of this in the fact that Raṭṭhapāla, Sudinna Kalandaka and others, when they become monks, address their former wives as sisters, to the despair of the wives.[72] The monk Udāyin whose wife has also become a nun, addresses her as sister.[73] Similarly, Ugga *gahapati* who is an *upāsaka* of the Buddha, addresses his wives as sisters at the time of his renunciation of worldly ties.[74]

The brother-sister relationship is characterised by "avoidance."[75] The proof of this is a little complicated. On the one hand we find that the nuns address each other as *ayye*, a term denoting respect.[76] The lay followers also address the nuns as *ayye*.[77] On the other hand we find that the monks address all women as sisters.[78] There seems to be no prohibition against normal relationship between either two nuns or between a nun and a lay follower. We also find that the relationship between a monk and woman is minimal. In one instance, the Buddha says, "It is better to talk with a man with a sword in hand than to be with a woman alone."[79] We may, therefore, presume that the minimal relationship is denoted in the use of the term "sister" by the monk. We find a further proof of this when the Buddha describes the seven types of wives to Sujātā.[80] One of the types is a "sister-like wife." "She behaves towards her husband as she would towards an elder sister" (i.e. with respect) and not a brother. The implications of change in the sex of the husband, only in the case of a "sister-like wife," suggests that the brother-sister relationship could not provide a model of behaviour for a wife. The only reason we can imagine for this is that the brother-sister relationship was an avoidance relationship, which would not be feasible between a husband and a wife. This is not surprising in a society where customary divorce is practised and where the household unit is the polygamous extended family, so that we may find half-sisters and classificatory sisters within

the household.

Husband and Wife

The terms of address for the husband are *ayya* , *ayya-putta*, *gahapati*, *sāmi* and the terms of reference are *pati*, *sāmi*, and *gahapati*. Marriage is polygamous and the term for a co-wife is *sapatni*.

That the marriage is polygamous, we can see from a number of instances. The brāhmaṇa Mahāgovinda has forty wives,[81] Raṭṭhapāla has many[82] (the number is not specified) and Ugga *gahapati* has four.[83] In some cases marriage is monogamous, as in the case of Nakulapitā,[84] Meṇḍaka *gahapati*,[85] Suppīya *upāsaka*,[86] Sudinna Kalandaka,[87] Rājā Muṇḍa,[88] and a *seṭṭhi* of Rājagaha.[89] At least in the cases of Rājā Muṇḍa and Nakulapitā, monogamy is accompanied by mutual love between husband and wife. There is reason to believe that monogamy was generally associated with poverty, but not necessarily so. Thus the brāhmaṇa who has many widowed daughters has "one wife, a tawny and speckled one."[90] At another time, the Buddha says that it is much more difficult for a man with one wife, ugly and poor, to go forth [to join the order] than for a rich with wives.[91]

No special reason is given in the text as to why a man takes another wife, except in the case of Kāṇā, whose husband takes another wife out of pique because Kāṇā's mother would not send her back to him in spite of his repeated warnings.[92]

If the husband is polygamous, the wife too, can obtain a customary divorce and even remarry. When Ugga *gahapati* renounces worldly ties, he offers his four wives a choice, "If there is any man whom you desire, I could give you to him." The eldest one chooses to take another man and is given to him by Ugga.[93] The brāhmaṇa *Purohita*, Mahāgovinda, also offers the same choice to his forty wives, when he renounces the worldly ties, but they choose to follow him in the path of renunciation.[94] The mother of Nakula during the illness of her husband reassures him that after sixteen years of conjugal life she will not "go to another man."[95] In one case, however, divorce and consequent remarriage are forced upon the husband and wife by the

wife's *ñātakas*. The husband unable to find any way out, kills the wife and commits suicide.[96]

In the polygamous household wives are sometimes jealous of each other. Thus, in the *Vinaya* , there is a story of two co-wives, one fertile and another barren. The latter secures the death of the unborn child of the former by administering a drug through a monk.[97]

A widow does not necessarily remarry. The mother of Nakula reassures her husband in the following words: "May be you think, when I am gone, the mother of Nakula may not be able to support the children nor to keep the household together. But by skill at spinning cotton and carding matted wool, she can support the children and run the household."[98] We also find that after their husbands become monks, the wives of the Buddha,[99] Sudinna,[100] Raṭṭhapāla,[101] and so on remain in their marital households. The only exception are the wives of Ugga *gahapati.*[102]

A wife does not inherit the property of her husband after his death. The son of a brāhmaṇa after the death of his father goes to his mother's co-wife and asks her to give him back the property of his father.[103]

On an inter-personal level, there exists conjugal love and affection. Rājā Muṇḍā is so much afflicted by the death of his beloved queen that he gives up bathing, anointing, eating and all work and clings day and night to her body. He even asks his treasurer to preserve her body in oil.[104] King Pasenadi, when he heard the news of his queen Mallika's death, "was sorely grieved and became sick at heart, his shoulders drooped, his mouth fell and he sat brooding, unable to speak."[105] The mother of Nakula says to her husband, that they were married in young age and hence were not conscious of having transgressed even in thought, much less in action.[106] When he expresses the fear that she may take another man after his death, she replies that they have lived a chaste life together for sixteen years and that has satisfied her; so she would keep her virtue in full.[107] The woman whose *ñātakas* propose to give her in marriage to another man says to her husband, "My *ñātakas* have forcibly taken me from you, they want to give me to another man. but I do not want him." The husband in despair

kills his wife and commits suicide, thinking that they will be together thereafter.[108] Monk Raṭṭhapāla's former wives desire him to go back to them.[109]

Sometimes, however, the wife's devotion to her husband arises out of duty rather than love. Thus, former wife of the monk Sudinna sets out to seduce him at the behest of his mother.[110] The brāhmaṇa Mahāgovinda's forty wives desire to follow him into renunciation.[111]

A woman is valued by her husband more than by her other relatives. Thus, when the wife of a *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Rājagaha is cured by Jīvaka, the son, the son's wife and the woman herself, each give four thousand coins to Jīvaka in gratefulness. But her husband gives him four thousand coins, plus a male and a female slave and carriage.[112] In another instance, when a *seṭṭhi gahapati's* son is ill and is to be operated upon, the doctor Jīvaka permits only the wife to be present at the operation.[113]

There are also cases of wives who quarrel with their husbands or treat them contemptuously. In one case the wife, who has become a nun, scolds her husband who is a monk, for not accepting personal services from her as he used to do so.[114] The wife of a poor brāhmaṇa with many daughters, wakes him up with her feet in the morning.[115] An old brāhmaṇa who marries a young girl is very henpecked. He promises to present her with a pet monkey (*makkaṭacchāpako*) if she gave him a boy. She is given the monkey before a child is born. Still dissatisfied, she sends him to the dyer to get the monkey dyed, pressed and thus makes a fool of him.[116]

Some wives are not chaste. One such wife who becomes pregnant by her lover when her husband is away, gets medicine from a monk in order to secure an abortion.[117] A Licchavi man consults the Licchavi *gaṇa* (council) in order to get their consent to kill his wife for committing adultery.[118]

In contrast to the instances of actual behaviour outlined above, we find the following stereotypes of the husband-wife relationship. In the *Sigālovāda Sutta*, it is said that the husband should treat his wife with respect, courtesy and faithfulness, hand over the authority to her and provide her with adornments. In turn, she should be

hospitable and chaste, skilled and diligent in all work, and should safeguard the property of her husband.[119] In another place the Buddha addresses the young women about to go to their husbands' house (*pati kulāni).* He says: "(1) A wife rises earlier than her husband and is the last one to retire. She willingly helps her husband, carries out his wishes and speaks with him affably. (2) She honours, reveres and respects all whom her husband reveres, such as his parents, *samaṇas* and brāhmaṇas. (3) She manages the household and those who live in it, the slaves, messengers and domestic servants. She cares for both the able and the sick and distributes food to every one according to his lot. (4) She is deft and nimble in the crafts of her husband's household and she knows how to get the work done and how to do it herself. (5) She safeguards her husband's property, his money, grains, silver and gold, and she is not like a robber, wastrel, or carouser." Only such a wife, the Buddha adds, can be reborn a *deva* after death.[120]

In another instance, the Buddha advises Sujātā, the unruly daughter-in-law of Anāthapiṇḍika who comes from a rich family. He says that there are seven types of wives, some approved and others not so. The first is "the slayer" (*vadhaka*) who is pitiless, corrupt, neglects her husband at night, and passes her time with others. She has been bought with money and is murderous. The second type is "the robber" (*corīsamā*), who takes his money and longs to impoverish him. The third is "the mistress-like wife" (*ayyāsamā*), who is lazy, indolent, expensive to maintain, who loves gossip and talks with strident voice. She lessens her husband's zeal and industry. These three types are harsh and distrustful, and live in hell after their deaths. But the fourth type is"the mother-like wife" (*mātusamā*), who has sympathy for her husband, cares for him as she would for an only son, and safeguards her husband's property. The fifth type is "the sister-like wife"(*bhaginī samā*), who respects her husband as she would an elder. The sixth type is "the companion-like wife" who is full of joy on seeing her husband, just as one meeting a friend after a long time. She is of gentle birth, chaste, and faithful to her husband. The last type is "the slave-like wife" (*dāsī samā*) who does not fear to take beating from her husband

and is calm, patient and obedient. The last four types are virtuous and will go to heaven on death. Sujātā after the discourse prefers to become a"slave-like wife."[121]

Mother's Brother and Sister's Son

Outside the family and the household, the mother's brother (*mātula*) is the most important relative. He is affectionate towards his sister's son, educates him, gives him gifts and settles him in life. Even when the latter injures him directly, he still remains lenient. Soṇadaṇḍa the brāhmaṇa points proudly to his sister's son Aṅgaka, of whom he says: "He is born well, is studious, learned, handsome and of good character. He is truly a learned man."[122] On another occasion he says: "He is born well on both the mother's and the father's side. I know his parents. I taught him."[123]

In another case a man requests the monk Ajjuka to choose between his sister's son and his own and decide who is the more faithful.[124] The monk chooses the sister's son. The mother's brother thereupon gives his wealth and settles his family, to the annoyance of his own son. The son appeals to Ānanda who decides that a monk should not interfere in such matters and that inheritance should go to a son. The monk Upāli to whom the final appeal is addressed, however, absolves the monk of interfering in the rule of inheritance, by saying that the monk has only to decide who is the more faithful one. He is not responsible for the consequences.[125] It is clear that although the sister's son has no right of inheritance, he can benefit economically from his mother's brother.

The king Ajātasattu attacks his mother's brother Rājā Pasenadi of Kosala and defeats him. But when they meet a second time in battle, Pasenadi captures him alive. Pasenadi, however, sets Ajātasattu free after taking his entire army as prisoners, thinking, "The king injures me without my doing so to him, yet he is my sister's son."[126] Even the Buddha recognises the importance of the mother's brother. A monk visits his mother's brother (*mātula*) who is ill in the army, although a visit to the army is an offence involving expiation. The Buddha after hearing a complaint about this makes an exception in the case of the mother's

brother who may be visited even in the army when ill.[127]

Among female relatives with whom sexual relations are considered incestuous is the mother's brother's wife (*mātulānī*). In this, it ranks with mother (*mātā*), mother's sister (*mātuccha*), teacher's wife (*ācariya bhāriyā*), and preceptor's wife (*guru dārā*).[128]

Husband's Parents and Son's Wife

The terms of reference for the husband's father and mother are *sassura* and *sassu* respectively; that for a daughter-in-law is *suṇha*. An important point about relationship between the husband's parents and daughter-in-law is that the latter derives her relationship through her husband, whom she must obey and respect. The husband in turn has the relationship of obedience and respect towards his parents. Thus, a daughter-in-law is in a doubly inferior position. That she sees her husband and his parents as a single category to whom she owes respect and obedience, is clear from the fact that in any reference to her, the husband's mother, his father and the husband are usually mentioned together in that order.

A bride on marriage goes to the family of her husband which is alien to her. She, therefore, tends to see it as a single unit. We find that a newly married woman (*vadhuka*) feels "extreme fear and bashfulness in the presence of her husband's mother, his father, and domestic servants." [129] The family also sees her as an alien coming to seek membership. Hence we find in the *Vinaya* [130] that the female members of the family are classified in descending order as, (1) woman of the family (*kula itthī*), (2) the daughters of the family (*kula dhītāyo*), (3) the young girls of the family (*kula kumāriyo*), (4) daughters-in-law of the family (*kula suṇhāyo*) and (5) the women slaves (*kula dāsiyo*).[131] It is important to note that the daughter-in-law is at the end of the list of relatives in the family but just before the slaves who are obviously outsiders; and are considered as members of the family only because they stay in the household. It is not, therefore, surprising that the daughter-in-law is sometimes treated as a slave. A prosti tute's daughter who married into a respectable family, complains that for a month she was treated as a daughter-

in-law should be, but afterwards as a female slave.[132] In the same story, however, we find a statement that some daughters-in-law are satisfied with their husbands' parents and husbands, while others are not.[133]

That the daughter-in-law is a member of the family is not in doubt. Thus, *gahapati* Meṇḍaka's household includes, his wife, his son, son's wife, slaves and domestic servants. However, among those who possess psychic power (*iddhi*) are Meṇḍaka, his wife, his daughter-in-law and his slave.[134] The possession of psychic power indicates the full integration of the daughter-in-law as a member of the family. Among the persons who give gifts to the doctor Jīvaka on the recovery of the *seṭṭhi gahapti*'s wife is her daughter-in-law. Like her mother-in-law and her husband, the daughter-in-law also pays four thousand coins.[135]

In terms of ideal behaviour, the daughter-in-law should rise up and offer seats and water to her husband's parents.[136] The Buddha consoles Rājā Pasenadi on the birth of a daughter by saying that she will get married and will respect her mother-in-law. Here, the mother-in-law is referred to as *sassudeva*.[137]

The actual behaviour of the daughter-in-law varies from one instance to another. When Sudinna desires to become a monk, it is his mother and not his wife, who attempts to dissuade him. Sudinna seeks his parents' permission but not his wife's. When he returns, it is again his mother who persuades him to give the family a child. It is she who instructs her daughter-in-law to be ready to receive him. The wife herself plays only an instrumental and passive role.[138]

But a daughter-in-law is not always obedient and respectful. Once the monk Upāli goes to a house, where the mother-in-law sits at the entrance door (*nivesana dvāra*), while the daughter-in-law is in the living room (*āvāsatha dvāra*). [139] The monk gives *dhamma* first to the mother-in-law and later to the daughter-in-law, separately and in private. As a result each of the women suspects Udāyi to be the lover of the other. It is, however, the mother-in-law who first asks her daughter-in-law a direct question to find out what the monk had said to her. The daughter-in-law replies suitably and in turn asks her mother-in-law and gets a similar reply. They both blame the monk for

arousing their suspicions.[140] In this instance we find that, although the mother-in-law has a superior position, she obtains the *dhamma* first, and declares her suspicions first, there is familiarity on the part of the daughter-in-law and even contempt in her suspicions. At another place it is said that a daughter-in-law after living in her husband's family long enough and gaining confidence addresses her husband and his parents thus: "Away with you, what do you know?"[141] Here also the daughter-in-law shows familiarity and contempt.

The Buddha, visiting the home of Anāthapiṇḍika, finds it full of high and loud voices. On enquiring he is told that the cause of the noise is Sujātā, the daughter-in-law of the house (*ghara suṇha*) who is herself rich and has been brought from a rich family (*aḍḍha aḍḍhakulā āṇitā*). The Buddha is also told, "she pays no heed to her husband's parents, to her husband or even to the Buddha." Anāthapiṇḍika requests the Buddha to advise her. At the end of his discourse Sujātā becomes a "*dāsi*-like wife"; respecting and serving all.[142]

Lastly, we find that an old brāhmaṇa in torn clothes complains to the Buddha that his sons in collusion with his daughters-in-law have shown him the door.[143] It is clear that the daughters-in-law have gained power over their husbands as well as their fathers-in-law.

Other Relatives

Among other relatives mentioned in the text are the mother's sister (*mātuccha*), [144] mother's sister's son (*mātuccha putta*),[145] a father's sister's son (*pituccha putta*),[146] father's brother (*pitā peyya*),[147] and father's mother (*ayyakā*).[148]

As we have seen, the Buddha is brought up by his mother's sister, who is also his mother's co-wife.[149] A sexual relationship with the mother's sister is sinful as that with a mother, and is, therefore, incestuous.[150] Sudinna's parents attempt to dissuade him by pointing to his father's wealth which he will inherit.[151] Rājā Pasenadi on the death of his father's mother says, that he would have given an elephant or a priceless horse or estates in order to save her life.[152]

Marriage

We find various forms of marriages and unions mentioned in the text. The most approved of them are the two forms *āvāha* and *vivāha*, invariably mentioned together. It is not very certain whether these are two ceremonies of one single form or two different forms. *Āvāha-vivāha* is arranged by the parents. The parties to the marriage are young and chaste (*kumāra kumārikā).* Upon marriage the wife goes to live with her husband's family. The following case will make some of the points of this marriage clear.[153]

> The monk Udāyi sees an unmarried youth (*kumārakaṃ vā apajāpatiṃ*) and an unmarried girl (*kumārikā vā aptikaṃ*). He praises the girl in the presence of the youth's parents. Udāyi says, "The girl is of such and such a family (*amukassa kulassa*). She is beautiful (*abhirrūpā*), charming (*dassaniyā*), lovely (*pasādikā*), learned (*paṇḍitā*), accomplished (*vyuttā*), wise (*medhāvinī*), clever (*dakkhā*), and industrious (*anālasā*). She is suitable for the youth." The youth's parents reply, "They (the girl's family) do not know us who and what we are. If you will induce them to give her, we may convey the girl to the youth."[154]
>
> The monk Udāyi then praises the boy in the presence of the girl's parents. He uses the same words of praise and advises that the girl is suitable for the youth. The girl's parents say to Udāyi, "They do not know us,who and what we are, nor do they know how much is the girl's property. If you will beg (*yācāpeyya*), we may give the girl to the youth." Thus Udāyi brings about"leading" (*āvāha*) of the bridegroom by the bride's family and "leading away" (*vivāha*) of the bride and the marriage takes place (*vāreyyāni pi vattāpeti*).[155]

A number of points are noteworthy. Firstly, the individual opinions of the girl and youth are conspicuously absent, although compatibility is suggested by imputation of identical qualities to both the parties. Secondly, the families of both the parties are unknown to each other. Thirdly, it is the status and position in society of the families on

both sides which are of importance. Presumably the families must be equal. However, when the marriage is being arranged the relationship between them is not equal but the youth's family is superior. We can see this through the way they appeal to the monk to bring about the marriage. While the youth's parents would like to induce the girl's parents, the latter would beg them to arrange the marriage. Also the youth's parents have to establish only the status and position, while the girl's parents have an additional obligation to pay dowry (*vatthu*). Fourthly, the marriages were arranged through an intermediary, in this case a monk. Lastly, *āvāha* literally means the leading of the bride (by the bride's family) and *vivāha* leading her away (by the bridegroom's family). The marriage is "virilocal." But the point is significant enough to give the form its nomenclature.

We have translated the term *mātā-pitaro* as parents; however, it appears that it may not necessarily refer to the mother and father only. It is perhaps of some significance that the parties to marriage are not son and daughter (*putta-dāra*) but youth and a girl (*kumāra* and *kumārikā*). This interpretation of *mātā-pitaro* is compatible with the meaning which we have assigned to it earlier.[156] We may, therefore, presume that the parents arranged the marriage, not only of their son's and daughter's but also all the charges under them within the extended family.

Another reference to *āvāha-vivāha* occurs in one of the Buddha's utterances. Contrasting supreme perfection to *āvāha-vivāha*, the Buddha says, "There is no reference to the question either of birth (*jāti vāda*), *gotta* (*gotta vāda*) or the prestige (*māna vāda*), which says that you are held as worthy as I or you are not held worthy as I,"it is in the talk of marriage (*āvāha-vivāha*) that reference is made to these things."[157] Here once more the emphasis is on the status and prestige in connection with *āvāha-vivāha*. This time, however, status is expressed in terms of birth and *gotta*.

Yet another reference to *āvāha-vivāha* is made when a *seṭṭhi* of Rājagaha, invites the Buddha for a meal. Anāthapiṇḍika, the husband of the host's sister, mistakes the preparations for the meal with those for a great

sacrifice, invitation to a king and a marriage (*āvāha-vivāha*).[158] This suggests that *āvāha-vivāha* involved considerable expense, particularly in the case of the rich.

There are ten forms of marriage mentioned in the text, all in one place.[159] These are: (1) When a woman is bought with money (*dhanakkhitā*). (2) When a woman stays of her own accord with a man (*chandavāsinī*). (3) When a man gives her money (*bhoga vāsinī*). (4) When man gives her clothes (*paṭavāsinī*) (5) When an ablution of water is performed (*odapattakānī*). (6) When she removes her headwear (*obhatacumbaṭā*). (7) When she is also a female slave (*dāsi-nāma*). (8) When she is also a servant (*kammakāri*). (9) When she is temporarily with a man (*muhuttikā*). (10) When she is captured in a raid (*dhaja haṭā*). It is obvious that the last four are no more than recognized unions. In the case of *dhanakkhitā*, *paṭavāsinī* and *bhogavāsinī* there is some economic exchange involved and, presumably, this gives some permanence to the union. In the case of *odapattakānī* and *obhatacumbaṭā*, a symbolic ceremony is emphasized. *Chandavāsinī* appears to be the only form where any symbol in the form of economic exchange or a ceremony are conspicuously absent. The woman lives with her lover of her own will. This is the nearest we get to a free and willing union. In the case of *dāsi* and *kammakārī*, the union may not be temporary but in these cases the special position of the woman is a prerequisite to the union. It is to be noted that not all *dāsis* and *kammakāris* entered into union by virtue of their position; if anything, these forms of marriage may show the strength of the authority-obedience relationship between the master and the servant.

It seems that the above do not exhaust all forms of marriage.[160] Thus:

> Some disciples of Ājīvikas coming from a distant village ask for the beautiful daughter of an ex-courtesan (*gaṇaki*) for their son. The ex-courtesan, however, at first refuses to give her daughter in marriage, but agrees after the intervention of the monk Udāyi. The proposal is accepted only on the fourth time. The marriage is described in the following manner: "That *gaṇaki* gave her daughter to the disciples of the Ājīvikas."[161]

It is to be noted that in this case, not the intermediary, but the family of the bridegroom makes the proposal, the intermediary also the monk in this case, mediates only when the refusal occurs. No *āvāha-vivāha* is mentioned, but the marriage is signified by the proposal *deyyāmi* and its compliance, *adāsi*. Both the terms denote the aspect of giving, presumably because in this form of marriage it is the girl's family who have a bargaining position.

In another case:

> Monk Anuruddha once stays at an inn (*āvāsathagāra*) in a village. The keeper of the inn, a woman (*itthī*), properly adorned, makes a proposal for a union to the monk (*pajāpati bhaveyyaṃ*). When the monk refuses, she tempts him by undressing. The monk still pays no attention. Thrice ignored, this time the woman offers wealth along with herself, but, of no avail. Surprised and shocked by the monk's refusal, she says, "Men have sent for me with a hundred or a thousand coins, but this monk in spite of my begging, did not desire to take me or my wealth (*sāpateyyaṃ*)."[162]

It is obvious that the woman at first proposes a temporary sexual union and only at last does she propose a permanent alliance. The term for union is *pajāpati bhaveyyam*. In this connection it may be noted that in the earlier case *kumāra* is described as *apajāpatim*, *kumāri* as *aptikaṃ*.[163] The emphasis in the term *pajāpati* is obviously on the sexual aspect of the union and not on the procreation of children as the etymology of the term denotes. The woman here is *itthī* and not *kumāri*, hence the use of the term *pajāpati*. It is used here only euphemistically. It is to be noted that elsewhere the term *pajāpati* is also used to refer to wives.[164]

Yet another form of marriage is described in the case of Ugga of Vesāli:[165]

> Of himself Ugga says, "I had four wives (*pajāpatī*), all young (*komāriyo*), and I went and spoke to them thus: "Sisters, (*bhaginiyo*) I have embraced the five rules of training. Who wishes may enjoy the wealth of this place, or may do deeds of merit, or may go to her own

ñāti-kula. Or are there some men you desire to whom I may give you?" When I stopped speaking the eldest wife said to me,"*ayya* give me to such and such a man." Then I sent for that man. Taking my wife by the left hand and holding a pot of water in my right, I poured water on their hands.[166] Yet I was not the least discomfited at parting with my wife (*dāram paric-cante*)."

In this case the wife is given away by a ritual denoted by the term *oṇojesiṃ*. This term occurs elsewhere, in connection with a gift.[167] The aspect of gift is also emphasized by *pariccante* , which denoted severance. The wives are described at first as *pajāpatiyo* and *komāriyo* thus emphasizing their sexual desirability. In the gift, however, the eldest wife is described as *dārā* obviously a more socially correct term for a wife. The second marriage of the elder wife appears to be no less recognized than forms of marriage which involve ritual. Ugga's abandonment of any rights in his wives is doubly emphasized first on an emotional level through the term *bhaginiyo*, and second on a ritual level.

The Brāhmaṇa Practise of Marriage

There are five types of brāhmaṇas mentioned in relation to marriage.[168] (1) The celibate "Brahmā-like" (*brāhmaṇa brahmā sama*). (2) "God-like" (*brāhmaṇa devā sama*). (3) Those who follow tradition (*brāhmaṇa mariyādā*). (4) Those who break with tradition (*brāhmaṇa sabbhinna mariyādā*). (5) The brāhmaṇa outcaste (*brāhmaṇa caṇḍāla*). The first type of brāhmaṇa is obviously celibate like the god Brahmā. The second and third type must marry only brāhmaṇa women, and with a ritual in which water is poured on the woman (*udakūpassaṭṭhaṃ*). The fourth and fifth type of brāhmaṇas marry both brāhmaṇa and other women: *khattiya*, *vessa*, *sudda*, *caṇḍāla*, *nesāda*, *veṇa*, *rathakāra* and *pukkusaka*. The ceremony in the last two types is through pouring of water (*udakūpassaṭṭhaṇa*) as well as through buying and selling (*kayena vā vikkayena*).

All types of brāhmaṇas, irrespective of their behaviour, are described as pure in lineage and also as versed in the

Vedas. The second and third type of marriage were for the procreation of children (*pajathāva*) and not for sexual enjoyment (*kāmattha, davattha* and *ratattha*), while the last two types were for all these.

It is obvious that only the first three types of brāhmaṇas carry some approval. The last two are disapproved of but do not lose their caste affiliation. All brāhmaṇas are pure in lineage. This is shown in the following case:

> In an argument with the brāhmaṇa Assalāyana, regarding the claims of the brāhmaṇas to superiority on the basis of birth, the Buddha gives an example of the brāhmaṇa. He says, "In Yona-Kāmboja and other outlying regions there are two *vaṇṇas*, the master (*ayya*) and the slave and it is possible for the master to become a slave or for a slave to become a master."[169]

The story assumes a meaning, when related to the explanation offered in the *Majjhima Aṭṭhakathā*. [170] It says that if a brāhmaṇa and his wife go trading in an outlying *janapada*, he may die there leaving no son. His wife may have previously had intercourse with a slave or servant (*dāso vā kammakāro*). In that case any son born would be a slave, although pure on his mother's side. This son goes to trade in a *majjhima janapada* and marries a brāhmaṇa woman. Any son born will be brāhmaṇa, though pure only on his mother's side. Whatever the truth of the commentary written a few centuries afterwards, a number of implications within the text and commentary are noteworthy. Firstly, the explanation offered in the commentary is social and not philosophical in its content, although the latter would be the easier to offer. Secondly, the term *vaṇṇa* is used to denote a two class hierarchy, supposedly existing in Yona-Kamboja and other outlying regions. Thirdly, the class affiliation of the brāhmaṇa woman in the commentary also applies to her son, whereas in Yona-Kamboja he is a slave, in *majjhim janapada* he is a brāhmaṇa, can marry a brāhmaṇa woman and also have a brāhmaṇa son. Lastly, the tracing of caste affiliation is through the mother when the father's lineage is partly or wholly non-brāhmaṇic.

In this connection we also find the names of brāhmaṇas, such as brāhmaṇa Sañjikāputta[171] and Sāriputta[172]

significant. The names are derived through the name of the mother in each case.

In another controversy with Assalāyana, the Buddha gives an example of brāhmaṇa union outside the brāhmaṇa group.[173] The Buddha says, "A *khattiya* youth consorts (*saddhiṃ saṃvāsaṃ kappeya*) with a brāhmaṇa girl. A son who is born out of this union is like his father and mother. He will be a *khattiya* and brāhmaṇa." The implication of this case become clear in yet another one which we give below:[174]

> The Buddha argues with brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha. A *khattiya* youth consorts (*saddhiṃ saṃvāsaṃ kappeyya*) with a brāhmaṇa girl or a brāhmaṇa youth consorts with a *khattiya* girl. A son is born out of such a union, the brāhmaṇas offer him seat and water. They invite him to partake food of *sāddha*, *thālipāka*, *yañña* and *pāhuṇaka*.[175] They also instruct him in sacred verses and do not prohibit his mingling with their women (*itthi*).
>
> The *khattiyas* would not consecrate such a son, because he is not pure by birth by seven generations on the mother's side in one case and on the father's side in another.

In the above cases, it is apparent that the brāhmaṇas, according to the Buddhist texts, recognize the caste affiliation of a person who is a brāhmaṇa on either side and there is no stigma attached to partial non-brāhmaṇic origin. The *khattiyas*, however, are more rigid and refuse to accept in their own group a man who is not pure by birth for seven generations on both father's and mother's side. It may also be noted that the term for marriage in this case is not *āvāha-vivāha* but staying together (*saddhiṃ saṃvāsaṃ kappeyya*).

In earlier part of the last case, the Buddha tells the brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha that the Sākyas are pure in descent and the brāhmaṇas are of mixed descent. He then tells the following story.[176] The ancestors of the Sākyas, Okkāka, sends his sons into exile. The sons go to the Himālaya and through fear of breaking the purity of the line intermarry with their own sisters. Ambaṭṭha's ancestor Kaṇhāyana is

born of a slave girl of king Okkāka. Kaṇhāyana having performed austerities, returns to king Okkāka and marries his daughter.

In this story, too, the emphasis is on the purity of line. The Buddha suggests that purity was maintained by brother-sister marriage, among the Sākyas. Brāhmaṇas on the other hand have a mixed origin, with a slave woman for an ancestress. The form of marriage here is the same as mentioned in other brāhmaṇa *khattiya* unions.

The last type of marriage is among the Vajjis.[177] One among the seven *dhammas* recounted by the Buddha to the Vajjians prohibits the overpowering of young girls and women of the family.[178]

Summary

It would be useful to summarise the points we have made above. There are several forms of marriage, none of them exclusively recognized. At one end, the union is *muhuttikā* a momentary sexual union; at the other end, we find *āvāha-vivāha* with a ceremony elaborate enough to be mistaken for a royal feast. *Āvāha-vivāha* marriage seems to be the ideal one for the *gahapatis*, since the term occurs in connection with them. The religious brāhmaṇas on the other hand have a ritual ceremony prescribed for them. The Sākyas, however, seem to recognize the special situation created by the union between the brāhmaṇa and *khattiya* through the use of the special term describing such unions. The Vajjians and Sākyas do not disapprove of marriage between brother and sister. Although the myth of Sākyas' origin from brother-sister union is obviously an exaggerated claim to purity, the accumulative evidence does not rule out marriages with classificatory sisters. Hence the Buddha's injunctions to Vajjians not to overpower *kula kumāris* and *kula itthis*. We assume, of course, that the injunction was a rebuke to the Vajjians for a prevailing practise. That this is so, becomes more likely from the statement that "a Licchavi husband who wants to kill his wife because she has committed adultery goes to the Licchavi *gaṇa* for counsel before doing so."[179] The extended kin group would be more interested in women who claimed affiliation on both sides than in those who

claimed it only through the husband.

The brother-sister marriage should not be taken literally in view of the scanty evidence. It is quite possible that the brother-sister union does not imply anything more than ethnic solidarity. On the one hand the injunction is to marry within the extended kin-group (we can see this from the non-recognition of the son born of a union with an outsider). On the other hand, there is the insistence on the "fraternal-sororal" solidarity of the ethnic group. In this connection the story of a man from Vesāli is of great interest. With the approval of a monk he gives gifts (*dāna*) and establishes (*kuṭuṃbam santhāpesi*) his sister's son in preference to his own. No doubt, the son objects to such an act, referring to gift and settlement as inheritance (*dāyāja*).[180] Although we recognize the fact that mother's brother and sister's son relationship is important in some tribal and peasant societies, the story would assume a totally different meaning if either cross-cousin or parallel cousin marriages were practised.[181]

Lastly, it would not be out of place to mention the account given by Buddhaghosa of Licchavi orgin:[182]

> An ascetic found a lump of flesh in a jar which turned out to be a boy and a girl. The two were attached to each other by the skin (*linā-chavi*) as if sewn together, so that they came to be known as Licchavis. The cowherds brought them up in the Vajji country. When they were sixteen years of age the king married the girl to the boy, and made a rule that no bride should be brought from outside, or a girl be given away outside. Sixteen pairs of twins were born to the couple (a boy and a girl each time). As those children grew up, there was not enough room for them. Hence a city grew up, and was named Vesāli (from *visāla*, large).

The story of origin is the same in its essence, as the one told by the Buddha of the Sākyas' origin.[183] The same credence may be attached to it, the only additional points are the sanctioning of the marriage and the resulting fertility of the union. If at all, this suggests a greater necessity to justify brother-sister marriage in Buddhaghosa's time than it was in our period.

Kinship Grouping

We now turn to the problem of ascertaining the kinship and quasi-kinship groups that may be found in the text. This is not an easy task, since they are not directly mentioned, but have to be inferred. We shall do this in two ways. Firstly, we shall examine a number of key terms and formalisations found in the text and impute to each of them some specific meaning. In doing this we shall no doubt find that some of these terms carry at various times different connotations, or that different terms denote the same group. But this should not prove an obstacle. On the contrary, we shall find, in the understanding of these connotations and denotations a true picture of the system of grouping. Secondly, we shall take the conceptual definition of the kinship groups most likely to be found in the Buddhist society (e.g. the household group, family, agnates) and find out how far they can be inferred from the data available from the text.

The Household Group

Within this group, it seems, a man's first duty is to his wife (*dārā*). The Buddha, in giving a simile, mentions that a man, who contracts a debt and sets up a business, should have a surplus (of income) to support his wife as well as to repay the debt.[184] In another case a rich *gahapati* and a *gahapatiputta* offer to lend money to a shopkeeper (*pāpaṇika*) so that he may enter the trade. They ask him to support his son and wife (*putta dārā*) and repay the debt by instalments.[185] The soldiers (*yodhājīva*), potters and silk-weavers carry on with their livelihood in order to maintain their sons and wives (*putta dārā*).[186]

After fulfilling the duty to support his wife and children, in other respects a man's mother and father (*mātā pitaro*) take precedence over them. Such is the case when Dhāñanjāni brāhmaṇa, accused of not being diligent, defends himself by saying that he should support (*posetabba*) mother and father, son and wife, slaves (*dāsa*) household servants (*kammakaraporiso*).[187] On another occasion a good man (*sappurisa*) is defined as one who cares for the welfare of mother and father, son and wife, slaves, and

household servants among others.[188] The Buddha advises that a man should work for the welfare of (*sakkaroti*) the members of his family defined in the same formula, as well as those who are employed by him in agriculture and trade and those who manage them (*khetta kammanta sāmanta saṃvohāre*).[189] In all these examples mother and father take precedence over all others. These descriptions being formal, such precedence denotes the prime importance of the mother and father in the household group. This can also be seen from the following instances where son and wife (but not mother and father) are significantly excluded on two important occasions. In the first instance, the Bodhisatta enquires of his charioteer about a corpse they see. In the reply given, we find that it is the mother and father (*mātā-pitā*) and agnates (*ñātisalohita*) who are grieved because they will not be able to see him (the dead man).[190] In the second instance in the *Vinaya,* a monk is permitted to visit only his mother and father (*mātā-pitā*), brother (*bhātā*), sister (*bhaginī*), and *ñātakas* when they are ill.[191] It is clear from the above that the mother and father are the most important members of the household group, in spite of the fact that a man's duty to support his son and wife rank first.

Before we proceed with the position of the other members within the household group, it is necessary to deal briefly with the implications of the sequences referring to kinship and quasi-kinship found in the text. Taken together, they apparently denote the total extent of a man's relationships. But this is not all. We find that the persons mentioned in the sequences vary from one instance to another depending on the context in which they are used. From this we may argue that in each of the sequences taken separately there is a gradually expanding circle of recognition of kinship and quasi-kinship, although the recognition itself depends on the context in which it is accorded. If we examine some of these contexts, we may find functional kinship and quasi-kinship groups that exist within the society. The following instances will make the arguments clear.

We suggest that the mother and father (*mātā-pitā*), son and wife(*putta-dārā*), slaves (*dāsā*) and household servants

constitute the household group. In the instance where a good man (*sappuriso*) is defined as acting for the benefit and welfare of the whole sequence of beneficiaries consists of the mother and father (*mātā pitunaṃ*), son and wife (*putta dāraṃ*), slaves (*dāsā*), household servants (*kammakāraporisā*), friends and acquaintances (*mittā maccānaṃ*), ancestors (*pubbapetānaṃ*), the king (*raññānaṃ*), the gods (*devānaṃ*) the recluses (*samaṇa brāhmaṇānaṃ*).[192] In the case of Dhānañjāni quoted above we have already mentioned that he should support only the mother and father (*mātā pitā*), son and wife (*putta-dārā*), slaves (*dāsā*) and household servants (*kammakaraporisā*). Apart from these, he should fulfil his obligations to (*karaṇiyaṃ kattabbaṃ*), friends and acquaintances (*mittāmaccānaṃ*), agnates (*ñātisālohitānaṃ*), guests (*atithinaṃ*), ancestors (*pubbapetānaṃ*) and the gods (*devānaṃ*). He should also do his duty to the king (*raññāyaṃ rājakarṇiyaṃ kattabbaṃ*).[193] There is thus a significant difference between the responsibility to support (*posetabba*) and to fulfil obligations (*karaṇiyaṃ katttabbaṃ*).[194]

In another instance when the wife of a merchant of Rājagaha is treated by the doctor Jīvaka, those who give gifts to the doctor in gratitude include the merchant's wife (*seṭṭhi bhāriyā*), her son (*putta*), her son's wife (*suṇha*) and the merchant (*seṭṭhi gahapati*) who gives the most.[195] Other subordinate members of the household, such as the gate keeper (*dvārapāla*) and slaves are mentioned, but they do not give gifts. Instead the merchant makes a gift of a male and female slave. *Gahapati* Meṇḍaka's house (*ghara*) consists of wife (*bhāriyā*), son (*putta*), son's wife (*suṇha*), slaves and household servants; all, except the household servants, are described as possessing psychic power (*iddhī*).[196] The Buddha tells Anāthapiṇḍika that alms are given as thank-offering for the enjoyment of good food (*uḷārāya bhattabhogāya*), clothing (*uḷārāya vatthabhogāya*),vehicles (*uḷārāya yānabhogāya*), for the five fold sensual pleasures (*ūḷāresu pañcesukāmaguṇesu*) and for having sons (*puttā*), wives (*dārā*), slaves (*dāsā*), messengers (*pessā*) and servants (*kammakarā*).[197] Son (*putta*), wife (*dārā*), brothers and cousins (*bandhavā*), acquaintances (*ammaccā*) and the caste group (*ñāti saṃgha*) are

said to be dependent (*anujīvino*) on a virtuous and believing head of the *kula* (*kulapatī*).[198] We find that the two kings Seniya Bimbisāra and Pasenadi and the respected brāhmaṇa Pokkharasādi are mentioned as accompanied by sons (*saputto*), wives (*sabhāriyo*), servants (*sapuriso*) and acquaintances (*sāmacco*).[199] Ānanda proposes to transmit the last homage of the Malla families of Kusināra to the Buddha through a formula which mentions the individual Malla family head by name, accompanied by sons (*saputto*), wives (*sabhāriyo*), servants (*sapuriso*) and ac quaintances (*samacco*).[200]

From the various sequences mentioned above, we can see that mother and father, son, wife, son's wife and slaves form the inner core of the household group. The household servants, although a part of the group, do not stand in the same relationship as the slave, since in the context of possession of psychic power, the former, but not the latter, are excluded.

That the friends and acquaintances (*mittāmaccā*) do not form a part of the household group is clear from the fact that in other sequences, where the members of the household groups are not mentioned, they figure along with agnates (*ñātisālohita*). The following are some examples in point:

When Keniya, the *Jaṭila* invites the Buddha and the monks for a meal, he asks his friends and acquaintances (*mittāmaccā*) and agnates (*ñātisālohitā*) to help in the preparations.[201] When a *yakkha* in the guise of a man attempts to persuade a leader of a caravan to throw away the provisions, the leader argues with his followers that since the man is neither a friend and acquaintance (*mittāmacca*) nor agnate (*ñātisālohita*) they should not act as if they trusted him.[202] In a third instance, an order to boycott Vaddha the Licchavi, is passed in the monastery when he accuses the monk Dabbha Mallaputta of committing adultery with his wife. When he "faints" on learning about the order, it is his friends and acquaintances (*mittāmaccā*) and agnates (*ñātisālohitā*) who console him and promise to reconcile him with the Buddha.[203] It is the friends and acquaintances (*mittāmaccā*) and agnates (*ñātisālohitā*) who gather round the *gahapati* Citta who is sick.[204] The friends

and acquaintances (*mittāmaccā*) and agnates (*ñātisālohitā*) of a leper (*kuṭṭhilapuriso*) procure the services of a surgeon to cure him.[205] On one occasion the Buddha advises, "Listen to those with whom you have sympathy (*anukampeyyātha*) and to those who think you should listen to them (*ye ce sotabbaṃ maññeyyaṃ*), whether they be friends (*mittā vā*), acquaintances (*amaccā vā*) "caste fellows" (*ñātīvā*) or agnates (*sālohitā vā*).[206] In the last instance, the king (*rājā*), and the king's ministers (*rājamahāmattā)*, friends, acquaintances (*amaccā vā*) and agnates (*ñātisālohitā*) are mentioned as tempting the monks to return to lower life by offering them money (*bhoga*).[207]

From the above instances it is clear that although there is a constant and close relationship with friends and acquaintances, they are not a part of the household group but fall just outside it. That this is so, is apparent from the instance of the monk Channa, who committed suicide as a result of disease. In this case, the Buddha blames the families of friends (*mittakulāni suhajjakulāni*) who, he thinks, instigated Channa to do so.[208] The use of the term *mitta* in conjunction with the term *kula* leaves no doubt that the friends did not belong to the household group.

We suggest that the term *mittāmacca* covers those persons who come into close interpersonal relationship and yet are not related through kinship ties. We may conjecture that these include not only friends and acquaintances in the modern sense of the term but also neighbours not related otherwise. Although there is little evidence, we may also argue that the term *mitta* refers to the neighbours of high or equal status and *amaccā* to those of comparatively lower status than the person concerned.

In the context of kinship, more than one term is used to denote the household group. One such term, though rarely used, is *kuṭumbaṃ*. In one instance, we find it used in the case of a *gahapati* who establishes his sister's son by giving him gifts[209] to the annoyance of his own son, who describes the gifts (*dānaṃ*) as his inheritance (*dāyājja*). Obviously the term *kuṭumba* is related in some manner to the concept of *dāyājja*, which is the right of a son, but not of sister's son. In another instance, a man has two wives

(*dve pajāpatiyo*) one barren and another fertile. It is said in this connection that if a wife becomes fertile she becomes the mistress of the whole *kuṭuṃba.*[210] The term *kuṭuṃba* refers, it seems, rather to the household group in its economic aspect, as is apparent from both these instances.

Another term sometimes used for a household group is *ghara.* Nakula's father who is ill is worried lest his wife should not be able to keep the household together (*gharāvāsaṃ santharitun'ti*).[211] On learning of his worry his wife reassures him. She says, among other things, "Do not think; when I am gone the *gahapati's* wife (referring to herself) will go to another house (*gahapatāni macchayena aññaṃ gaharaṃ gamissati*)."[212]

A third term for the household group is *kula.* The monks begging alms are usually described as being dependent on household (*kulūpako hotuṃ*) or as going to many households.[213] Thus Udāyi is described as being dependent on household going to many households.[214] The term *kula* has also been used to denote residence. Thus, in giving a simile to the hostile brāhmaṇa Aṃbaṭṭha, the Buddha says: "The quail, little bird (*sakuṇikā*) though she be in her own nest (*kulāvake*), she can say what she likes; it is the same with the Sākyas in their own home in Kapilavatthu."[215]

Recapitulation

The household group as we saw, includes such quasi-kin as the slaves (*dāsā*) and household servants (*kammakārapurīso*). We advisedly call them quasi-kin, although they are not related by kinship ties in any sense, because in terms of responsibility for support they rank with the closest relatives.

We have only followed the convention in translating the term *dāsa* as a "slave." We have contrasted it with the term *kammakārapurīso* which may be literally translated as "worker-men." We have, however, rendered this as "household servants," for two reasons. Firstly, we intended thereby a separation of the two categories, *dāsa* and *kammakārapuriso.* Secondly, through the adjective "household" we emphasized their membership of the group. The notion of worker (*kammakāra*), we felt, was sufficiently covered by the rendering "servants." We hardly need to

point out that what is of significance is the interactional difference which exists between *dāsa* and the *kammakāra-purisa*. Although in the modern senses of the terms "slave" and "servant, "the former has the inferior position vis-a-vis the master, it need not be necessarily so. In fact, it seems possible that the slave-master relationship within the household was comparatively more privileged for the slave than the servant-master relationship was for the servant. In the important instance cited above, the slave receives the family's *iddhī*, but not the servants.[216]

The Family

Till now we have confined our attention to the household group. We turn next to the concept of family. An important difference between the concepts of "household" and "family" is that in the latter there is a greater emphasis on the recognition of kinship ties. Obviously, the members of the household group also consist of relatives but, as we have seen, other persons are also present. The family as a kinship group is a part of the kinship structure and hence bears relation to other parts.

The most important term denoting the family is *kula*. From the numerous instances we have discussed in relation to the household groups, it is obvious that *kula* denotes an extended family rather than a nuclear one. The former consists of mother and father (*mātā pitā*), son, wife (*putta dārā*), son's wife (*suṇha*), brothers (*bhātā*) and sisters (*bhaginī*) and possibly other relatives also.

Perhaps the clearest reference to the family (*kula*) is when it is stated that the mother and father "desire a son to be born in the family" so that he may add to the property what should be added, do what should be done, establish permanently the family line, receive and transmit the inheritance and give offerings to the departed ancestors.[217]

That the term *kula* has been used to denote the family is also apparent from the following references found in the text. Thus, the brāhmaṇa Lohicca[218] inviting the monk Kaccāna says, "As Kaccāna visits the families of the lay devotees (*upāsakakulāni*) of Makkarakaṭa village, let him visit the family of Lohicca (*Lohicca kulaṃ*)."[219] On another occasion the king puts the family of a keeper of a

garden (*ārāmika kulaṃ*) into prison. A little earlier, the keeper of the garden is described as having a wife and a daughter.[220] On a fourth occasion the Buddha inquires of Anāthapiṇḍika whether alms are given in his family (*kula*) or not.[221] In a fifth instance a woman (*mātugāma*) is described as going to the family of her husband (*patikulaṃ*) in tender age and "becoming without the *ñātakas.*"[222] In a sixth instance, the Buddha is accused of bringing about barrenness (*aputta katāya*), widowhood (*vedavyāya*) and destruction of the family (*kulupacchedāya*).[223]

The connotation of the family by the term *kula* is also apparent in the use of such terms as *kulaputta*, *kulapati*, *kulajeṭṭha* and so on. The term *kulaputta* refers to a junior male member of the family and stands in contradistinction to such terms as *kulapati* and *kulajeṭṭa.* Thus the Buddha advises on different occasions *kulaputtas*, one of them, Dīghajānu Koliyaputta, and another a brāhmaṇa, Vijaya, to mix with the *gahapatis*,*gahapatiputtas* and elders (*vuddha dahara*).[224] The text advises that the *kulaputta* should engage in profession (*sippasthāna*) involving counting coins (*muddāya*), reckoning (*gaṇanāya*) and counting (*saṅkhāya*).[225] In another instance, a son of a *seṭṭhi* when asked by the monk Upananda for the robe which the former is wearing, refuses saying that, being a *kulaputta*, people will enquire about his wearing only one robe (instead of the usual two).[226] In another instance, *kulaputtas* are described as going from the household to a state of houselessness (*agārasmā anagāriyaṃ*).[227] Since the Bhikkhus think about brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha that he is of distinguished family and a pupil of the brāhmaṇa Pokkharasāti, the Buddha will not find it difficult to hold conversation with a *kulaputta.* [228]

The term *kulaputta* has the connotation of being a junior member of groups, based on the extended family or otherwise. Thus, as mentioned above, we find the Buddha referring to Dīghajānu Koḷiyaputta as *kulaputta.*[229] On another occasion the Buddha refers to his monks as *kulaputtas.*[230] In yet another instance the Buddha's attendant, the monk Meghiya, refers to himself as *kulaputta*, thus acknowledging the headship of the Buddha.[231]

The term *kulapati* definitely refers to the head of the

family. Those under his tutelage (*antojana*) progress as a result of faith, chastity, knowledge and perception.[232] As we have seen earlier, those who progress under him are son and wife, brothers, acquaintances and members of the caste group (extended-kin-group) (*putta dārā, bandhavā amccā ñātisaṃgha*).[233]

The relationship between the junior members of a family and the head are described in the following instances. In the first a good man (*supurisa*), is described as among other things, one who defers to the elder of the family (*kula jeṭṭha*).[234] On the other hand, in a list of those who must act for the welfare of their charges is he who makes himself a power in the family (*kulesu paccekādhipacaṃ*), coming as he does in the sequence after the consecrated king (*khattiya muddhāvasatha*), the head of a country (*raṭṭhikassa petanikassa*), the chief of an army (*senāya senāpatikassa*), the chief of a guild (*puga gāmaṇikassa*) and the head of a village (*gāma gāmaṇikassa*).[235] Here, however, the *kula* refers perhaps not so much to an individual extended family but to some larger kinship group.

Turning to the economic aspect of the family (*kula*),we find in the *Vinaya Suttavibhaṅga* that a village (*gāma*), a residence (*nivesana*), a stable (*uddhosita*), a verandah (*aṭṭo*) a watch tower (*māḷo*) a cottage (*hammiya*), a boat (*nāva*), an agricultural land (*khetta*), and a threshing floor (*dhāññakaṇiya*), may all belong to one family (*eka kulassa*), or to many separate families (*nānā kulassa*).[236] In another instance, the Buddha says that families which have acquired great money do not retain it permanently due to four actions.[237]

A term denoting a group larger than the family and perhaps including the family is *kulaparivatta*. We find a reference to this when Ānanda transmits the last homages of the Mallas of Kusināra to the Buddha. Apprehensive that the night may pass before the Mallas are able to pay the homage individually, Ānanda thinks of causing the Malla families to stand in groups (*kulaparivattaso*) so that he may refer to them (in his announcement to the dying Buddha) through the name of the individual Malla (*itam nāmo Mallo*) and as accompanied by sons (*saputto*), wives (*sabhāriyo*), with servants and slaves (*saporiso*, which

indicates household staff including *dāsas* and *kammakāras*) and acquaintances (*samacco*).[238] The circle here is presumably larger than the family since it has among it the acquaintances. The friends (*mittas*) are conspicuously absent, presumably because they themselves, being of equal or higher status, form their own circle of families. *Kulaparivatta*, however, is only a temporary group, formed to meet the emergency, since we do not find any other reference to it elsewhere in the text.

Whereas the term *kula* denotes family in general, whether one's own or somebody else's, the term *ñātikulāni* denotes families other than one's own but belonging to the same "caste" or extended kin-group (*ñāti*). The following instances will make the content of the term clear. In the first instance, when a monk of Rājagaha arrives after a long time to the "caste families" (*ñātikulāni*) [239] the people say, "The most respected one has arrived at last. Please keep the meal ready." Although the actual behaviour suggests the affection and respect felt towards the monk by the members of his "caste-families," the term *manussa* (for the people) is highly general and significantly fails to indicate any specific relationship.

In the second instance, however, the relationship is more specific. Ugga *gahapati*, renouncing secular life, suggests that his wives should have the option of going to their caste families (*ñātikulāni*).[240] In a third instance, the brāhmaṇa Mahāgovinda, who actually accepts the life of a *samaṇa*, makes a similar suggestion to his forty wives before leaving the household.[241] In a fourth instance, a nun, a pupil of Bhaddakāpilini, having quarrelled with other nuns, comes to the village of her caste families (*gāmakaṃ ñātikulaṃ āgamāsi*).[242] In a fifth instance a brāhmaṇa invites monks for a meal. The monks eat at the brāhmaṇa's house to their satisfaction and yet go to their "caste-families" (*ñātikulāni*) with alms bowls, where some of them eat and some receive alms. Only when the annoyed brāhmaṇa talks to his neighbours (*paṭivassaka*) does the matter reach the Buddha, who makes such conduct an offence involving expiation.[243]

It is clear that some of the monks found it in order to receive alms and even eat a second time in the houses of

"caste families." The Buddha made it an offence in order that the monk may not overeat and not annoy the first host. There is no injunction against either eating with "caste families" or receiving alms from them. On the contrary, the first and the last instances taken together, suggest that such action constitutes privileged behaviour welcome to both the monks and the "caste families." It should, therefore, be avoided only when it annoys a host who has already entertained the monk concerned.

Ñātisālohita

The only kinship term to be found in the texts which refers etymologically to the blood tie is *ñātisālohita.* Obviously it denotes the agnates. It occurs on most occasions in conjunction with and immediately after the term for friends and acquaintances (*mittāmaccā*) and hence we may take it that the relationships are similar in both cases and as such are evoked on the same occasions. The following references make the agnatic relationship clear.

From the case of brāhmaṇa Dhānañjāni, we find that one should oblige the agnates.[244] The Buddha advises that one should listen to the agnates, for one has sympathy with them and they think that one should listen to them.[245] Keniya, on his part, calls upon his agnates to help him when he invites the Buddha and his monks to a meal.[246] Vāseṭṭha, a lay disciple wishes that his agnates may also keep a fast along with him so that they, too, may obtain merit.[247] The caravan leader, whose charges have been persuaded by a ill-meaning *yakkha* to throw away the provision in the midst of a forest, calls upon his men to ignore the *yakkha* on the ground that the latter is not an agnate and hence should not be listened to.[248]

That the agnates on their part have an affection and responsibility for the person is seen through the following examples. A *devatā* (presumably the dead ancestor) who is the agnate of Tapussa and Bhallika asks them to carry food to the Buddha and thus acquire merit.[249] On a man's death, apart from the mother and father, it is the agnates who grieve since they will not see the dead man again.[250] In the case of a leper it is his agnates who procure the service of a surgeon, to cure him of the disease.[251] Similarly when the

gahapati Citta is ill, his agnates, among others, gather round him.[252] In his quarrel with the monk Dabbha Mallaputta, Vaddha Licchavi is assured by his agnates that they will intervene to reconcile him.[253] The text mentions on two occasions that it is the king and his ministers, friends and acquaintances and the agnates who tempt a monk to lower life by offering him riches.[254]

It is significant that the agnates loom large in sickness and in death and even thereafter especially ritually. Apart from the instances noted above, there is another one in which prince Dīghāvu finds the dead bodies of his parents, King Dīghiti of Kosala and his queen, in the ground where they were executed. The Prince Dīghāvu makes the funeral pyre for them and lights it. King Brahmadatta of Kāsi who observes the scene from his palace and does not know the identity of the son, concludes that the lighter of the funeral pyre must be an agnate (*ñāti vā sālohito vā*) of those who were on the funeral pyre.[255] In yet another instance we find that a brāhmaṇa, explaining to the Buddha, maintains that the purpose of the *saddhā* (*śrāddha* skt.) is that the gifts (*dāna*) made therein should reach the agnatic ancestors (*ñātisālohitānaṃ petānaṃ*).[256]

The Ñātakas

If *ñātisālohita* refers to the patrilineal side, the term *ñātaka* recognises the bilineality of the kinship group. On several occasions in the text, a *ñātaka* is defined as one who is related "on the mother's side or on the father's side, back through seven generations."[257] That the affines are not included under *ñātaka* is apparent from two separate instances. In the first one, a woman who goes to the family of her husband (*patikulaṃ*) is described as "becoming without the *ñātakas* (*ñātakehi vinā hoti*)."[258] In the second one the monk Udāyi on being questioned by the Buddha whether a particular woman is his *ñātaka* or not, denies that she is one although she is his wife.[259] From these two instances as well as the definition, it becomes clear that even a wife remains outside the bilineal kinship group (of her husband).

The *ñātaka* relationship is analogous to that of the agantes. Thus we find a warrior (*yodhājiva*) wounded by

his enemy dies while being carried on his way to his *ñātakas*[260] and that a man whose limbs were severed lives surrounded by his *ñātakas*.[261] Similarly when a monk falls ill, his *ñātakas* send a message offering to nurse him during the illness. More significantly, the *Vinaya* rule permits a monk to go to his *ñātaka's* home in such a case.[262] That the *saṃgha* should recognise the *ñātaka* ties even after a person becomes a monk is repeatedly made clear. Thus, *Vinaya* elsewhere permits a monk to visit his sick mother, father, brother, sister and *ñātakas* if he is sent for.[263] A monk can accept as much curry from a *ñātaka* as he wants, but from others he must take half in solid food and only half in curry.[264] Similarly, from the incident between the monk Upananda and the *seṭṭhi's* son, when the former asks the latter for the robe that he is wearing, the Buddha makes a rule that to insist on getting such a robe from anyone who is not a *ñātaka* would mean an offence involving expiation (*pāccatiya*).[265] On the positive side, when the monk Sudinna goes to Vesāli, his *ñātakas* give him sixty offerings of food, a costly but willing recognition of the relationship.[266] In the instance involving Udāyin and his wife (who is a nun), the Buddha observes, "One (a woman) who is not a *ñātaka* does not know what is suitable and what is unsuitable, what is pleasant or what is unpleasant....Whatever monk should get a soiled robe, washed, dyed or beaten by a nun who is not a *ñātaka*, there is an offence involving forfeiture (*nissaggiya*)."[267] Ordinarily, a monk may not get a robe washed or dyed by a nun, ask for a specific cloth from householders,[268] ask for many robes,[269] or a robe for which he makes specifications,[270] or ask for dyeing, combing and washing of wool by a nun,[271] or accept food (alms) from a nun,[272] or give robe material to her,[273] or sew or cause to be sewn a robe for a nun.[274] But in all such instances these acts are permitted if they occur between the *ñātakas*. On the other hand the Buddha disapproves of a nun who met in private her *ñātaka puriso* who came from a distant village. The Buddha rules that a third person must be present at such meetings.[275]

The above references to the *ñātaka* group are concerned solely with extending or limiting recognition to it in so

far as the *saṃgha* was concerned. The group as such is recognised by the monks as well as the *saṃgha*, but the son and wife (whom one's prime duty is to support) are conspicuously omitted, lest the renunciation be meaningless. But we have no evidence whether in secular affairs, when monkhood and the *saṃgha* were not directly involved, *putta-dārā* were included under the term *ñātaka* or not.

That *ñātisālohita* is a group covered under the bilineal *ñātaka* is clear from the following instance. It is said that the man who loses his "caste" (*ñāti*) feels, "Formerly I had many friends and acquaintances and agnates (*ñātisālohita*)....now these *ñātakas* have diminished (*ñātaka parikkhayaṃ gacchati*). So it is not easy for me to acquire more wealth or to use wealth or to use what is already with me."[276]

Summary

We have isolated four kinship and quasi-kinship groups viz., the household group, the family, the agnatic group and the bilineal. We saw that the household consists of a number of primary relatives, the wives of these relatives who are affines and the dependents such as slaves, household servants and so on. We found that the family is a somewhat different unit from the household in that in the latter case the emphasis is on living together, while in the former it is on its recognition in society as a kinship unit. Thus we found that *kula* approximated to the concept of family in which not only the members of a household but also others such as friends and acquaintances were sometimes included. The unity of the *kula* was recognized by the use of such terms as *kulaputta*, *kulapati* or *kulajeṭṭha*, the former meaning the junior member of the family and the latter the head of the family, or by the use of such expressions as *kulupako hoti* referring to the dependence of monks on certain families for alms and other purposes.[277]

While the total membership of the above two groups is understandably vague, that of the agnatic and the bilineal group is definite. The membership of the agnatic group is indicated through the reference to the blood tie contained in the term as well as the contexts in which it has been used. The membership of the *ñātaka* group on the other

hand has been explicitly defined in the text and the definition indicates the bilineality.[278]

In this connection we may note that there is no separate term for the affinal group, although a number of affines are separately mentioned, as can be seen from the inter-personal relationships outlined at the beginning of this chapter. This does not necessarily mean that the affines outside the family group, i.e., with the spouse's parents and siblings, were rarely or never recognised. Though, of the many possible affines, we find only two mentioned in the texts. The first is in connection with an encounter between Anāthapiṇḍika, the *seṭṭhi* of Sāvatthi, and his sister's husband, when the former goes to Rājagaha.[279] The second one is when an ex-courtesan goes to plead on behalf of her daughter, married at a long distance, with the latter's husband's parents.[280]

Another set of relatives are the mother's brother (*mātula*) and his wife (*mātulāni*). According to a strict interpretation of the term *ñātaka* the mother's brother and his wife stand outside the group. Whatever their position, it must be remembered that in almost all societies which make an extensive use of kinship organization, the mother's brother and his wife occupy a special position. That this is so, is seen from the instances of interpersonal relationship among the sister's son and mother's brother and his wife described above, especially the fact that sexual intercourse with the mother's brother's wife is classed as incest.[281]

Inter-Group Organization

We have already shown in some detail the membership of the *kula* and how it represents an extended family unit. It is then inevitable that the *kula* should also figure in the organization at the inter-group level (i.e. in social stratification). To start with, we may note some of the instances which illustrate the *kula* as a unit of inter-action at a group level.

One such instance is when the brāhmaṇa Lohicca requests the monk Kaccāna to visit the Lohiccā's family (*Lohicca kulaṃ*) as the latter visits the *upāsaka's* families (*upāska kulāni*) of the Makkarakaṭa village.[282] Another instance is that of a horse-trainer who destroys an untrainable horse

lest his teacher's family (*ācariya kula*) should lose status[283] (*avaṇṇo ahositi*, literally means becoming without *vaṇṇa*). A third instance is when the junior member of an ancient family (*porāṇa kulaputta*) is described as having lost status (*khiṇa kolinaṃ*, literally weakened quality of *kula*).[284] In the fourth instance the parents desire a son to be born in the family (*kule jāyamānaṃ*) so that he may establish the family line permanently (*kulavaṃso ciraṃ thapassati*).[285] In the fifth instance we find various reasons given why the *kula* "having attained great possessions does not maintain wealth in permanence (*kulāni bhogesu mahantaṃ pattāni na ciraṭṭhakānaṃ bhavanti*)."[286] We need hardly point out that in all these instances the different *kulas* are thought of as units and that in each case we may infer a preoccupation (however vague) with status or prestige.

There are a number of ways in which the *kula* figures as a unit in the system of stratification of the Buddhist society. One such way is when the term is used in conjunction with the basic conceptional (sometimes also real) social groups such as the brāhmaṇa, *khattiya*, *vessa*, *sudda*, *gahapati*, and so on. Thus we find the following statement: "there are four *kulas*, they are *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa*, and *sudda* (*kulā nāma cattāro kulāni*).[287] In another instance those who are born in high *kula* (*uccakulā pacchāāto*), are identified as the *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa and *gahapati*, and described as being bright (*joti hoti*) but likely to go into darkness (*tamo parāyano*) or brightness (*joti parāyano*). Those born in low *kula* (*nīca kulā paccājāto*) are the *caṇḍāla*, *nesāda*, *veṇa*, *rathakāra*, and *pukkusaka*, who are in darkness (*tamo hoti*) but likely to go into darkness or brightness.[288] In the third instance the Buddha refers to the *khattiya kula*, *brāhmaṇa kula*, and *rājaññā kula*. And contrasts them with *caṇḍāla kula*, *nesāda kula*, *veṇa kula*, *rathakāra kula* and *pukkusaka kula*.[289] Ekusāri, the brāhmaṇa, claiming the superiority of his class, refers to their *kula* and maintains that everyone, i.e. the *khattiya*, *vessa* and *sudda* should serve the brāhmaṇa.[290]

The brāhmaṇa *kula* seems to be of special importance. Thus, the Buddha in his conversation with the brāhmaṇa

Vāseṭṭha refers to the latter as being born of a brāhmaṇa (*brāhmaṇa jaccā*) belonging to a brāhmaṇa (*brāhmaṇa kulino*) going from a brāhmaṇa *kula* house to houselessness (*brāhmaṇa kulaṃ agāraṃ anāgāriyaṃ pabbajito*).[291]

On another occasion a group of nuns passing through a village in Kosala *Janapada* is described as approaching a brāhmaṇa *kula*, i.e. the house of a brāhmaṇa.[292] In another instance the Buddha refers to brāhmaṇa *kula* whilst enquiring about the "*paccārohaṇa*" ceremony of the brāhmaṇa.[293] When others come to know of the low ancestry of the brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha they call him ill-born (*dujāto*), not a junior member of the *kula* (*akulaputto*) but the son of a slave mother (*dāsiputto*).[294] The brāhmaṇa Pokkharasādi addresses the Buddha as "the son of Sākyas (*Sakyaputto*), one who has left the Sākya*kula* (*Sakyakula pabbajito*)."[295] Elsewhere the Buddha is referred to similarly.[296]

All these instances go to show that *kula* affiliation was more important to the brāhmaṇa and those of the high status; those of low status were imputed *kula* affiliation in order to assert their status rather than to express their unity.

In the above instances the *kulas* are identified through their affiliation with the larger social groupings, such as the *khattiya* , *brāhmaṇa*, *vessa*, *sudda*, *gahapati*, *rājaññña*, *cāṇḍāla*, *nesāda*, *veṇa*, *rathakāra* and *pukkusaka*. Although some of these groups overlap each other, and others such as *rājaññña's* are a category, the aim is to categorise the *kula* into them and assign them either high or low status. Our interest lies in the fact that it is not the individual but the *kula* which is the unit of reckoning.

The term *kula* of high status (*ucca kula*) is also used in order to indicate the economic status of the family. Thus, we find that the Buddha is referred to as belonging to a *kula* of high status (*uccā kulā*), which is resolved gradually into (I) prime *khattiya kula* (*ādinā khattiyakulāni*), (II) rich *kula* (*aḍḍha kulāni*). *Aḍḍha kula* is, however, resolved into great riches and great fortunes (*mahaddhanā mahābhogā*).[297] On one occasion the Buddha talks about men from (I) *kula* of high status (*uccā kulā*), (II) great *kula* (*mahā kulā*), (III) *kula* of great riches (*mahāboga kulā*) and (IV) *kula* which is extremely wealthy (*uḷāra bhoga*

kulā).[298] On another occasion the *kulas* of high status (*uccākulāni*) are resolved into prosperous (*mahāsāla*) *khattiya kula, brāhmaṇa kula*, and *gahapati kula.*[299] In this reference, prosperity is obviously associated with membership of the three social groups with high status, viz. *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa and *gahapati.*

That the high status of the *kula* and the individual belonging to it is correlated to the fact of birth is clear from the following examples. The Buddha apparently not liking the brāhmaṇa Sundarika's enquiry as regards his origin says, "Do not ask of the origin (*jāti*), ask of the behaviour. Just as a fire can be born out of any wood, so can a saint be born in a *kula* of low status.[300] The well known saying, "not by birth one becomes a brāhmaṇa but by deed (*na jaccā hoti brāhmaṇo ...kammuno hoti brāhmaṇo*)," expresses a similar attitude.

The Buddha gives explanation as to why some human beings belong to low families (*nīcākulīno hoti*) and some to high families (*uccākulīno hoti*). He says that a woman or a man who is callous (*thaddho*) conceited (*atimānī*) and who does not respect and honour, wherever the honour and respect is due, is born after death in a low family. Whereas a woman or a man who behaves properly by doing exactly the contrary to what is stated in the case of a behaviour of a low born, is born in a high family.[301] However, the fact that a person is born in a low family may not hinder his spiritual growth. Thus here the Buddha refutes that *jāti* and *kula* affiliation was of any ultimate importance. On the other hand the brāhmaṇa Soṇaṇḍa describes his sister's son, Aṅgaka as well born (*sujāto*).[302]

We have already seen how the brāhmaṇa Ambaṭṭha is found to be of low status (*dujāto*).[303] That the origin is recognised from both the parents is apparent when a well known brāhmaṇa or the Buddha is described as born well from both the sides, mother's as well as father's (*ubhato sujāto mātito ca pitito*).[304] This leads us to the general issue of status ascribed on account of the birth in a particular social group.

Jāti

Jāti is only one of the several concepts found in the texts

which ascribe status on account of birth. Like the *kula*, *jāti* is also resolved into *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa* and *sudda* groups.[305] The *Vinaya* elsewhere states that there are two *jātis* the low *jāti* (*hīna jāti*) and the excellent *jāti* (*ukaṭṭā jāti*). The low *jātis* are, *caṇḍāla jāti*, *veṇa jāti* (basketmaker *jāti*) *nesāda jāti* (hunter *jāti*), *rathakāra jāti* (charioteer *jāti*). and *pukkusaka jāti* (sweeper *jāti*). The excellent *jātis* are the *khattiya* and the brāhmaṇa.[306] On another occasion also there are said to be two *jātis*, the high (*ucca*) and the low (*nīca*), and they are resolved into the *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa*, *sudda*, *caṇḍāla* and pukkusaka *jātis* respectively.[307]

The third grouping based on *jāti* is attributed by the Buddha to his contemporary Puraṇa Kassapa. According to Puraṇa Kassapa there are six *jātis*. The first one is the black *jāti* (*kaṇhābhi jāti*) and consists of mutton butchers (*orabbhikā*), pork butchers (*sūkarikā*), fowlers (*sākuṇikā*), hunters (*māgavikā*), violent men (*luddhā*), fishermen (*macchaghātakā*), robbers (*corā*), robber-killers (*cora ghātakā*), jailers (*bandhanāgārikā*) and all who follow a bloody trade (*kurūrakammantā*). The blue *jāti* (*nīlābhi jāti*) consists of: *bhikkhus* who live as though with a thorn in the side (*kaṇṭakavuttikā*) and all other who profess the deed and doing theory (*kammavādā kiriyāvādā*). The red *jāti* (*lohitābhi jāti*) include the Jains with one cloth (*niganṭṭhā ekasāṭakā*). The yellow *jati* (*haliddābhi jāti*) consists of white robed householders (*gihī odātavasanā*) and followers of naked ascetics (*acelaka sāvakā*). Ājīvakas and their followers are the white *jāti* (*sukkābhi jāti*). The purest white *jāti* consists of the Ājīvaka leaders, Nanda Vaccha, Kisa Saṅkicca and Makkhali Gosāla.[308] The Buddha, however, refutes the six-fold groupings made by Puraṇa Kassapa and maintains that there are two *jātis* the black and the white. Even these are decided by birth since the black *jātis* may breed a black one or white one and white *jāti* may do the same.

On another occasion the Buddha denies that any reference can be made to the theory of *jāti* (*jātivāda*) when supreme perfection in wisdom and righteousness is being considered. The Buddha says,"*jāti vāda*, *gotta vāda*, *māṅa vāda* theories of *jāti*, *gotta* , and *māna* (prestige) which says you

are held as worthy as I, you are not held as worthy as I, it is only in marriage (*āvāha–vivāha*) that a reference is made to such matters."[309] On another occasion the text states that a king would enlist as bowmen the *khattiya kumāra, brāhmaṇa kumāra, vessa kumāra,* and *sudda kumāra,* irrespective of their *jāti* (birth).[310]

The grouping made through the use of the concept of *jāti* is interesting in many ways. Firstly, it recognises the two-fold division of the society, the low and high, the low and excellent, and the black and white. Even the Buddha accepts the last division though he uses it to refute the concept of *jāti* in the matters of spiritual attainments. In doing so the Buddha expressly recognises the operation of *jāti-gotta* in social interaction. Puraṇa Kassapa, on the other hand, is obviously interested in conceptualising the existing divisions (groups and categories) within the society based on occupation, trade, caste and sect affiliations. He is in that sense a forerunner of Manu.

The textual resolution of the low *jāti* into occupational groups starting with *caṇḍāla* and ending with *pukkusaka* should be taken to indicate an order of lowness, in which *caṇḍāla* is the lowest and *pukkusaka* is the highest.[311] We may also point out that *jāti* was sometimes used as an identification in conjunction with other criteria such as name, *gotta* and *manta* (Vedic learning) in the case of a brāhmaṇa.[312] The Buddha on one occasion has been identified with the Sākya *jāti* by the brāhmaṇa Amabaṭṭha.[313] Sundarika brāhmaṇa asks the *jāti* of the Buddha not recognising him at first. The Buddha answers that he is of Sākya *jāti.*[314] That both sides, the mother's and father's, are important, is illustrated from Soṇadaṇḍa brāhmaṇa's claim, that his sister's son is born well on both sides,[315] and Amabaṭṭha's stigmatisation *dāsi putta.* The Buddha as well as the well known brāhmaṇas such as Soṇadaṇḍa, Kūṭadanta, Canki are described among other things as "born well on both sides" and recognised according to the theory of *jāti* (*anupakuṭṭho jātivādena*), literally meaning not ignored by the theory of *jāti.*[316]

Gotta

Gotta has been used mainly as a diacritical mark (i.e. for

the purpose of identification). Thus a brāhmaṇa woman is described as belonging to Veracchāni.[317] Aṅgulimāla the robber who turned a monk, claims that he is of Gaggeya *gotta* by his father and of Mantāṇi *gotta* by his mother.[318] A man who sees a beautiful country woman (*janapada kalyāṇi*) should enquire of her *gotta* among other matters.[319] A man shot by a poisoned arrow insists on knowing the identity of the bowman and enquires of his *gotta* among other things.[320] As we have already seen, a man remembering his previous births comes to know of his earlier *gotta.*[321] Ambaṭṭha, who is thought to be of Kaṇhāyana *gotta*, is found to be *dāsi putta* of the Sākyas, when he follows the name and *gotta* of his ancestors (*mātāpetikaṃ nāmagottaṃ anusarato*).[322] Other *gottas* mentioned specifically are Bhāradvāja,[323] Kassapa,[324] and Ākāsa.[325]

The Buddha acknowledges himself to be of Gotama *gotta.*[326] Sometimes *gotta* name is preferred to the first name of a person when he is addressed. Thus the Buddha addresses brāhmaṇ Saṅgārava as Bhāradvāja.[327] Buddha addresses his father Suddhodana as Gotama.[328] The *gotta* in this sense (from the above cases) denotes lineage affiliation.

However, the text maintains that *gotta* affiliation is rendered valueless in spiritual affairs. Thus it says,"The mortals are purified by deeds, knowledge and *dhamma* , not by *gotta* or wealth."[329] On another occasion it is said,"As rivers lose their name and *gotta* when reaching the ocean, so the four *vaṇṇas*, lose their name and *gotta.* When they accept *dhamma* and join the order; they are known as *samaṇa sakyaputtiyas.*"[330] Thus, the *gotta* is used in the sense of a diacritical mark here. On becoming monks persons lose their lineage affiliation and acquire a new one.[331]

However, *gotta* is also used to indicate status. Thus, the *Vinaya* states, "There are two *gottas*, the low (*hīna*) and the excellent one (*ukkaṭa*). Kosiya *gotta* and Bhāradvāja *gotta*, are low in this *janapada*; Gotama, Moggalāna, Kaccāna, Vāseṭṭha are high."[332] The implications of the *gotta* and its brāhmaṇic influence has been discussed elsewhere.[333]

The *Vinaya* definition of *gotta* follows immediately after the definition of *jāti.*[334] Hence it is not difficult to see why *gotta* has been categorised into high and low.

However, as we see, even the text recognises the impossibility of using *gotta* in the two-fold division and hence limits the observation to "this *janapada*" (presumably meaning *majjhima janapada*).[335] We may safely conclude that though *gotta*, through indication of lineage affiliation does carry status and prestige with it, it does not reinforce the twofold stratification of society into high and low. It is also significant that there are almost no references to the affiliation of the low group. Presumably they did not possess one. The only exception is Āṅgulimāla. But he is not only a robber but also a brāhmaṇa. Moreover, there is something of the prodigal son returning home in him.[336]

The Vaṇṇa

Like *jāti* and *gotta*, the *vaṇṇa* too has been used as a diacritical mark. A description of true brāhmaṇa contains a reference to his *vaṇṇa*.[337] The monk who remembers his previous births also remembers his *vaṇṇa*.[338] A man desires a beautiful woman (*janapada kalyāṇi*), but cultivates an imaginary interest in her without, however, knowing about her *vaṇṇa*, that is whether she is of black (*kāḷo*), brown (*sāmo*) or pale (*maṅguro*) complexion (*vaṇṇā*).[339] The man shot down by the poisoned arrow inquiring about the identity of his assailant wants to know, among other things, whether he is of black, brown or pale *vaṇṇa*.[340] In a guest house (*āgantukāgāre*) the people, namely *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa* and *sudda*, come from four directions and take up their residence there.[341]

The term *vaṇṇa* has also been used to indicate the fourfold division of the society. It is often stated that there are four *vannas* and they are *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa*, and *sudda*.[342] In conversation with the Buddha, Rājā Pasenadi asks: "I am asking about a future state. There are four *vaṇṇas* , *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa*, *sudda*, and they are possessed of five qualities of striving. Now, *Bhagavā* (the Buddha), could there be any distinction, any difference between the four *vaṇṇas*." The Buddha answers through a simile: "It is as if there may be among elephants, horses, or oxen to be tamed, two elephants, two horses or two oxen that are well trained and well tamed, and two of each that are not tamed and trained. What do you think about this?

Would these two elephants, horses and oxen that are to be tamed, when so tamed and trained, reach the tamed state? Would they attain a tamed rank."[343] The Buddha explains to the King Ajātasattu that there are four *vaṇṇas*, *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa*, and *sudda* . Among these the *khattiya* and the brāhmaṇas are pointed to as chief; that is to say in the way of addressing them, rising up from one's seat for them, saluting them with joined palms and rendering them service.[344] It is clear that the Buddha, like the text, recognises the fourfold division, which is real and yet through his simile, professes an eventual extinction of it, when the lower *vaṇṇa* (presumably) will reach the standards of the higher, through the five qualities of striving.

That the Buddha accepts the four-fold division is clear from another instance. The brāhmaṇas of Sāvatthi hear of the Buddha that "Gotama teaches the purity of fourfold *vaṇṇa* (*gotamo cātuvaṇṇiṃ suddhiṃ paññāpeti*) and these brāhmaṇas come to verify this statement.[345] On another occasion, the Buddha in describing his dreams says that four birds of different *vaṇṇas* come from four directions and sit at his feet; likewise the monks from four *vaṇṇas*, *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa*, and *sudda*, come within his fold.[346] When a man joins the Buddhist order, he becomes without a *vaṇṇa* (*vevaṇṇiyanti*).[347] A *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa*, and *sudda*, if he exerts himself may attain the supreme purity.[348]

There are instances where the term *vaṇṇa* is absent, though the fourfold division of the society into *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa*, and *sudda* group often occurs. We have referred to some of these before, and we refer to further cases here. Thus we find that a man who gives gifts to a *samaṇa*-brāhmaṇa in the hope of some return concentrates (so that he may obtain them) on a wealthy *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, and *gahapati* (*khattiya mahāsāla*, *brāhmaṇa mahāsāla*, and *gahapati mahāsāla*).[349] While instructing the monks, Sāriputta tells them that during their wanderings in various *janapadas*, they are likely to be asked questions by *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *gahapati*, and *samaṇa* scholars (*paṇḍitā*).[350]

King Pasenadi complains to the Buddha that as a judge he saw wealthy *khattiyas*, brāhmaṇas and *gahapatis*

(*khattiya mahāsāla, brāhmaṇa mahāsāla,* and *gahapati mahā-sāla*) deliberately lying in order to fulfil wordly desires.[351] Queen Mallikā says to the Buddha that in the *rājā's* family (*rājakula*) there are *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa,and *gahapati* maidens (*kaññā*) and over them she holds supremacy (*issarādhipaccaṃ karem*).[352] Elsewhere a *khattiya* is described as one whose aim is wealth, quest is wisdom, resolve is power, ideal is domination, want is territory. The brāhmaṇa is one whose aim is wealth, quest is wisdom, resolve is Vedic learning, ideal is sacrifice and want is the fruit of sacrifice. The *gahapati* is one whose aim is wealth, quest is wisdom, resolve is craft and want is the fruit of enterprise (*kammanto payoja*).[353] Whereas there are four *vaṇṇas* there are eight assemblies (*parisā*). They are *khattiya parisā*, brāhmaṇa, *gahapati*, *samaṇa*, *cātu-mahārāja* (four divine kings), *tāvatiṃsa* gods *māra* and the assembly of the *brahmā* gods.[354]

From the above instances, and those throughout the chapter, it is apparent that the fourfold division of society into *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa*, and *sudda* group is sometimes replaced by a threefold one consisting of *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, and *gahapati.*

Ñāti

We argue that *ñāti* or extended kin-group functions as an effective caste and in that sense, therefore, is nearer to the modern sub-caste.

The Buddha gives a special permission to former members of another sect (*aññatithiyo pubbo*) who are Sākyas by birth (*jātiyā sākiya*), because they are of the same *ñāti* as Buddha.[355] For others, however, there is a probationary period. When the Buddha died, remains of his body (*sarira bhāga*) were claimed by the Licchavis of Vesāli, the Koliyas of Rāmagāma, the Mallas of Pāvā, the Bullis of Allakappa and the Moriyas of Pipphalivana, on the ground that they were *khattiyas* and the Buddha was also a *khattiya.* Ajātasattu of Magadha claimed the body on the ground that he was a *khattiya* and the Buddha was also a *khattiya.* It is claimed by the brāhmaṇa of Veṭṭhādipa on the ground that he was a brāhmaṇa whereas the Buddha was a *khattiya.* But the Sākyas of Kapilavatthu claimed it on

the ground that the Buddha was the greatest one in their *ñāti* (*amhākaṃ ñātiseṭṭho*).[356]

The monk Sudinna during the famine goes from Vajjian territory to Vesāli so that he may get alms-food from his *ñāti*, and by giving food his *ñāti* may achieve merit.[357] Roja Malla says to Ānanda: "I am not impressed by the Buddha, *dhamma* or *saṃgha*, but a rule was made among the *ñāti* (*ñātihi saṃgara kato*) that whosoever does not go to meet the Buddha will be fined five hundred (coins). It is due to fear of punishment from *ñāti* (*ñātinaṃ daṇḍa bhayāya*) that I go."[358]

Among the four kinds of losses which cause renunciation, loss of *ñāti* (*ñāti pārijuññaṃ*) is one. The loss of *ñāti* is further explained as reduction in the *ñātakas*.[359] A man of low character lies when he is asked to go as a witness before a meeting (*sabhāgato*), an assembly (*parisāgato*), *ñāti* (*ñāti majjhagato*) a royal court (*rājakula majjhagato*).[360]

The brāhmaṇa Soṇadaṇḍa refers to the Buddha as "the *samaṇa* Gotama who has left his home after giving up a great *ñāti* group (*mahantaṃ ñātisaṃghaṃ ohāya pabbajito*)."[361] The *gahapati*, *gahaptiputta* or others leave home after giving up a small or great circle of *ñāti*. A woman (*itthi*) is protected by *ñāti* among others. Here the text explains that it is the *ñātakas* who protect her.[362]

If the Buddha were to become a householder, he would have been a king, and would have abundance of wealth and corn, land and property, four footed animals, strong and able *ñāti*.[363] There are five losses (*vyasanāni)* among which the loss of *ñāti* and of wealth are given precedence over the others.[364]

The powers of a respectable woman (*mātugāma*) are the power of beauty (*rūpabalaṃ*), of money (*bhogabalaṃ*), of *ñāti* (*ñātibalaṃ*) of having a son (*putta balaṃ*) and of decency (*silabalaṃ*).[365] A lay person with faith (*ariyasāvaka*) who obtains riches through work and diligence must give five shares (*bali*). These are: shares to *ñāti* (*ñātibaliṃ*), to a guest (*atithibaliṃ*), to ancestors (*pubbapetabaliṃ*), to the king (*rājabaliṃ*) and to the gods (*devabaliṃ*).[366]

Among the various topics prohibited to a monk is the gossip about *ñāti* (*ñātikathā*).[367] The man whose limbs

have been cut off is surrounded by his *ñātakas* in the house belonging to the *ñāti*.[368] When the monk Sudinna goes to his own village, his *ñātidāsi* sees him and reports the matter to his mother.[369]

The term *ñāti* is sometimes used in conjunction with *kula* (family) as can be seen from the following instances. The *gahapati* Ugga of Vesāli permits his wives to go to their *ñātikula* if they so desire.[370] Likewise, the brāhmaṇa Mahāgovinda permits his forty wives to go to *ñātikula* and seek another husband (*ñātikulāni gacchantu añaṃ bhattāraṃ pariyesatu*).[371]

When a monk of Rājagaha arrives after a long time to his *ñātikula*, people say, "At last the *bhikkhu* has come, keep the meal ready."[372] The monks, reinvited by the brāhmaṇa, go to their *ñātikula* even after they are satisfied by him, some of them with alms bowl to beg food.[373] A nun, a pupil of Bhadda Kāpilāni, who quarrels with nuns, goes to her *ñātikula* in a village (*gāmakaṃ ñātikulaṃ āgamasi*).[374]

At this stage, it would be useful to point out the significance of various usages of the term *ñāti* mentioned above and at the same time compare *ñāti* with the modern concept of caste. Thus we can see from the above usages that when the term *ñāti* has been used by itself, it denotes like the modern caste a social group. At other times it is coupled with the terms such as *saṃgha* or *parivaṭṭa* (circle) which themselves indicate grouping. It is significant that *Sakyajāti* (those born of Sākyas) are the same *ñāti* as the Buddha who is also born a Sākya. The Buddha, instead of disregarding this affiliation (as he does in the case of other conceptual or"status imputing" groups such as *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa*, and *sudda* or high and low, low and excellent, *jāti*, *vaṇṇa* and *gotta*) specifically recognizes it in rules of recruitment in the *saṃgha*.

The Buddha is acknowledged by the Sākyas of Kapilavatthu as their *ñātiseṭṭho* whereas the other extended kin-groups (ruling) claimed identification with Buddha on the grounds of their common *khattiya* origin. This shows that *ñāti* is a smaller group than the *jāti* or *vaṇṇa* groups which are normally mentioned as *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa* and *sudda* , or as *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, and *gahapati*. It is also significant to note that the term *ñāti* is not used to

indicate status. There is no arrangement of *ñāti* in the same manner as in *jāti*. The last is due to the fact that where a status is associated with social functions, there is an absence of a general caste system in the modern sense.

Like the modern caste *ñāti* may take evidence, make rules and impose punishment in the form of a fine. A man must offer a share to the *ñāti* when he obtains wealth. The loss of *ñāti* is serious and may lead to renunciation. A woman may rely on her *ñāti* and consider it a power. A nun may go to *ñāti* on account of a quarrel. A monk may resort to it at the time of a famine. Women on being forsaken by their husbands can go back to their *ñāti* families. And the people welcome a monk of their *ñāti* with food. The monks have to be prohibited from gossip about *ñāti*.

There is no direct reference as to the composition of the *ñāti* group. But the use of the term in conjunction with the term *kula* suggests that it possibly consisted of a number of *kulas*. In the term *ñātikula*, *ñāti* is used as an adjective qualifying *kula*. The intention of such a use is clear; it seeks to point only to a certain *kula*, not one's own, from which help may be sought. The brāhmaṇa Mahāgovinda asks his wives to go to their *ñātikula* and seek husbands.

In one of the instances mentioned above, *ñāti* is resolved into *ñātaka* to bilineage. Buddhaghosa defines *ñāti* as the spouse's parents (i.e. affines).[375] But in view of the above illustrations, Buddhaghosa's explanation does not stand. The text as well as the Buddha are in clear agreement that *ñāti* is a kinship group, equated with *ñātakas* by text, with affines by Buddhaghosa. To take the textual explanation as correct, would mean the existence of two terms for the same real (as opposed to conceptual) group, which is not a very tenable situation. The only way out is to accept that Buddhaghosa by indicating affines sought to show that the *ñāti* group was larger than *ñātaka* and also included the affines. In such a case, we are not confronted with the existence of two terms for one real group. The text would be right in having two terms especially as we have shown that *ñātaka* obviates the necessity of a separate term for affines. Buddhaghosa too would be partially justified in pointing out that the specific affines, the spouse's parents that are difficult to subsume under the term *ñātaka* are the *ñāti*.

Buddhaghosa's explanation is correct in so far as he sought to indicate a larger group than the *ñātaka* , wrong in so far as he limited *ñāti* to specific affines.

The equation of the Buddha's *ñāti* to Sākya in fact suggests, that although *ñāti* was a kinship group, it was larger than the sum total of actual kinship generally recognised under terms such as *ñātaka*, *ñātisālohita*, *kula* and so on.

The Conceptual and Real Social Groups

It would be appropriate to discuss the general issues of the kinship groupings. This can be done by isolating and pointing to the real from the conceptual groups mentioned in the text. The reality of a group lies in the fact that such a group can be isolated on the basis of the functions it performs. Secondly, a real group is related to other such groups which are within the society. Thirdly, the actions of the members of a real group are governed by the knowledge of the membership of it. Conceptual groups are those which categorise the society in terms of some sociological criteria usually for the purpose of understanding the working of a society. They may or may not be real. In so far as they are not real, they will be categories rather than groups. The validity of categorisation will depend on the concept used. An elementary use of concept of high and low in order to understand the stratification is an example in point.

We have found that the concepts of household, family, *ñātisālohita*, *ñātaka*, *vaṇṇa jāti*, *gotta*, and *ñāti* have been used in the text. The concept of household is chiefly expressed through the mention of relatives and quasi-relatives in given order. Sometimes the term *kuṭuṃba* also bears the meaning of household. The term for the family group is *kula* and its variations; *ñātisālohita*, *ñātaka* and *ñāti* are the larger kinship groups we have been able to discover. All these groups are real. In contrast *vaṇṇa* and *jāti* and its subdivisions are the concepts found in the text in relation to social stratification. It occurs where a status position is claimed or denied because of it. We may conclude from this that the very claims and their denial suggest the absence of settled grouping in terms of *jāti* and *vaṇṇa*. The most we can claim about the reality of *jāti* and

vaṇṇa, is that they were the criteria in terms of which, high and low status was contested by an individual. As criteria of grouping we must deny their reality.

Conclusions

Nature of the Extended Family

From our study of the inter-personal relationships at the beginning of the chapter, it is apparent that the family unit was larger than the nuclear family (man, wife and unmarried children). The extended family unit, as we would like to call it, consisted of a man and his mother-father, son, wife, son's wife, brothers, sisters and other dependent relatives. The household group on the other hand was even larger, and included slaves and household servants. It perhaps included friends and acquaintances, agricultural workers and their superintendents.

From the extensive use of the term *kula* and various meanings that we have been able to discern from its usage it is clear that there were no hard and fast divisions in day to day affairs between the family and the household group.

The family with which the literature deals in its kinship aspect was a patrilineal group with a head known as *kulapati* or *kulajeṭṭha*. The junior male members of the family were known by the generic term *kulaputta*. Ideally the behaviour of the family members towards the head was marked by respect and obedience, and the head on his part exercised wisdom and authority.

The position of women in the family was inferior to that of men. A woman was respectable only if she was protected by some one. She had her immediate relatives, her mother, father and husband as protectors. The residence on marriage was patrilocal.

Descent was patrilineal and so was inheritance. Only in one case do we find a sister's son preferred to one's own. However, from the importance attached to the *ñātaka* group, and also from certain specific references, the mother's lineage has some bearing on the social status of a person. In a ritual context on the other hand the family was a patrilineal unit. The evidence of ancestor worship and the extended nature of the family are sufficient to indicate

this. Succession was also patrilineal.

The family was also an economic unit. As we shall see in the next chapter in the economic and non-kinship aspects, the head of the family was generally described as a *gahapati*. We shall also show that the term *gahapati* was not restricted to one caste but could apply to any householder in non-kinship and economic affairs.

2. *Caste*

We have mentioned that *ñāti* is the largest kinship group in the Buddhist society. However, the term, by itself and when it is used in conjunction with the term *kula*, fails to indicate any definable interactional relationship between it and the person concerned. The term is very much unlike *ñātaka* or *ñātisālohita* both of which have been defined in the text directly or otherwise. Much as we may try ,we cannot arrive at any specific definition of the term *ñāti* in terms of actual kinship relationship. This leads us to believe that the term which is obviously a kinship term refers not to actual kinship relationships but to potential ones. This fits in with the idea of caste as we know it.

The presence of caste-like elements in Buddhist society, however, does not necessarily imply the presence of a developed caste system. By a caste system we mean a system of social stratification, in which caste was used as a unit of ranking. So far as we can see, endogamy and commensality, two fundamental characteristics of modern caste, are absent. Such evidence as we have, point to the fact that marriage with a non-*ñāti* was permissible outside caste especially when the two category stratification was not violated. Thus, we find marriage between *khattiya* and brāhmaṇa mentioned without any strong disapproval. On the other hand when a brāhmaṇa is married to a *dāsi* there is a definite stigma attached to it.

Social Stratification

A number of systems of stratification have been used, of which *vaṇṇa* is one. To stress the obvious, it is based on the four categories, *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa, *vessa*, and *sudda*. As we have seen, however, only the brāhmaṇa and *khattiya* are social groups in any true sense. The *vessa* and *sudda*

categories are residual and cannot be identified with real social groups.

From the evidence presented we can see that *vaṇṇa* is a two category system with brāhmaṇa and *khattiya* forming upper category, and *vessa* and *sudda* forming the lower. The struggle for status was confined mainly to *khattiya* and brāhmaṇa groups. They form the two opposing subcategories, each one aspiring for a ritually superior status. It seems that the brāhmaṇa, in fact, do occupy a status superior to that of *khattiya*; the latter do not acknowledge it and challenge it through the person of the Buddha and through their political power. We repeat that the *khattiya* is a category and at best a diacritical mark; the real social groups are the ruling extended kin-groups which bear this mark. The *vessa* and *sudda* form the lower category which do not participate in the *khattiya*-brāhmaṇa struggle for superior status.

Chapter VI

Occupational Divisions, Gahapati and Money

IN Chapter V, we attempted to demonstrate the fact that kinship plays a vital part in the ordering of social relationships in the Buddhist society. We showed that the extended family is an important social group within the kinship system. We may, therefore, expect with some justification that kinship relationships and particularly the family, influence the ordering of economic relationships. That this is so, we demonstrated partly in the last chapter by stressing the mutual economic obligations of the relatives and by pointing out that the family was both a consuming and property-holding unit.

In this chapter, however, we shall be concerned with productive and distributive activities and, therefore, will attempt to find out whether the family operates as a group in these economic activities as well, and if so how. We shall deal with this in due course. For the moment we turn to the immediate task of ascertaining the nature of productive and distributive activities and how they are organised. We shall describe these activities and consider how many of them are organised as occupations.

The emergence of *gahapati* from the Vedic householder to a comparatively wealthier head of the household is symptomatic of the period represented by the texts. We shall consider in this chapter the role of *gahapati* in society and the concept of money as understood and articulated by the Buddhist writers.

It is difficult to arrive at a satisfactory definition of occupation but we may define it for our purpose as a set of activities designed to produce a livelihood. But in deciding whether or not an activity (or a set of activities) may be called an occupation, we shall use the following criteria. Firstly we shall ascertain the specialisation involved in it. Such specialisation usually involves the acquisition of skill or of a period of apprenticeship. But it may also be

based on the possession of the appropriate ritual or social status by the person who engages in it. This status may again be achievable or ascribed. Secondly, we shall consider whether a number of separately mentioned activities, which are similar in other respects (though not identical) and carry the same ritual and social connotations, can in fact be grouped under a single occupational label or not. This would be useful, especially where the prolificity of terms indicating activities denotes variety in material culture but not so much in the social organisation. For example, *ambapālaka* (keeper of a mango orchard) and *jambupālaka* (keeper of a rose-apple orchard) mentioned in one single social context do not enhance our knowledge even if we differentiate between *amba* and *jambu*. In such cases, it would indeed be more sensible to group both together and call it one occupation. What we are concerned with in our analysis is not so much the variety of fruits as with the social position of the *pālakas* (the keepers) of fruit orchards vis-a-vis other occupations.

A variety of productive and distributive activities is mentioned in the texts through the descriptive terms which refer to the men engaged in such activities. For example, pottery as an activity is shown through the term *kumbhakāra*. Our task is then made simple if we make a list of such terms and proceed with their material and socio-economic implications through examining the various contexts in which they occur. We shall call these "activity-denoting" terms occupations. But those terms which do not add to our knowledge in the socio-economic context, we shall group under one generic occupation and deal with as such.

Of the variety of such occupations, food producing (*kasigorakkha*) and trading (*vaṇijja*) are more or less open to all. But as they need to be dealt with in some detail, we shall turn to them later. For the moment, we deal with the other terms.

The most important of the terms concerned with occupations is *sippa*. It is sometimes translated as craft.[1] That the term is a generic one can be seen from its use in the instance where a brāhmaṇa living by various crafts (*puthusippena*) is called a *sippiko*.[2] In another place *sippas* are

divided into high and low. The high *sippas* are specified as counting coins (*muddā*), accounting (*gaṇana*) and writing (*lekhana*); the low ones are those of the leather worker (*cammakāra*), the reed-worker (*naḷakāra*), the potter (*kumbhakāra*), the tailor (*pesakāra*) and the barber (*nahāpita*).[3] Also Jīvaka in desiring to learn a *sippa* chooses medicine.[4] In yet another context a low caste acrobat, while talking to his assistant (*antevāsi*, calls their activity a *sippa*.[5] With reference to this, farming and cattle rearing (*kasigorakkhā*) and trading (*vaṇijjā*) are referred to as vocations (*kammaṃ*).[6] In yet another place *sippa* is differentiated from farming (*kasiyā)*, trading (*vaṇijjāya*), cattle-rearing (*gorakkhena*), bowmanship (*issithena*), the king's service (*rājaporisena*) and mendicancy (*bhikkhācariyāya*).[7] It is clear, therefore, that the term denotes what may be called professions, manufacturing crafts such as those of the potter and reed-worker, the service crafts such as that of the barber, and lastly entertaining, which is better described as an art. In our opinion, therefore, *sippa* , is a term which covers both manual and non-manual skills and hence is a more inclusive term than craft when craft is used to denote a manual skill only. We may, therefore, translate it as occupation. But in doing so we must also remember that the texts do not necessarily always identify all occupations as *sippa*, and that there are some occupations at least which may not be identified as *sippa* .

Service occupation

Seen in the above manner we find that the washerman-dyer (*rajaka*), the painter (*cittakāra*), the barber (*nahāpita, kappaka kasāvaṭo*), the tailor-weaver (*pesakāra, tantavāya, tunnavāya*), and cook (*āḷārika, sūda*) are the persons who follow service occupations. The *rajaka* washes the clothes and returns them to the owner.[8] He also dyes cloth, and perhaps paints on it as well.[9] The *cittakāra* also paints but does so on well polished panels, walls and cloth.[10] That of *nahāpita* is perhaps the most recorded of the service occupations. His sons, who follow the same craft when he is old, go round the local community giving their services in exchange for food to be used in giving a meal to the Buddha and the monks.[11] He acts as a messenger for a

brāhmaṇa.[12] When the Sākya youths go out of their country to join the order, he is their servant-companion and the recipient of the personal effects (*alṃkāra*) of his masters.[13] His occupation is listed as a low *sippa* [14] and he is abused by angry nuns as lowborn (*nihīna-jacco*) and the remover of dirt (*malamajjano*).[15] Yet his craft may not have been very low, because the brāhmaṇa Lohicca uses him as a messenger and even the king Makhadeva addresses him as *samma*, a term which denotes familiarity, instead of *bhaṇe*, the term more appropriately used by a master for a servant.[16] The fact that he is used as a messenger at all shows his role to be greater than denoted by his occupation. That this is so, can also be seen from the fact that he betrays king Dīghiti, who was at one time his master, to the king of Kāsi, where he stays.[17] On another occasion, he receives the gift of a village (*gāma varaṃ*) from the legendary king Makhadeva for being his personal attendant.[18]

The occupation of a *pesakāra* is also described as low *sippa.*[19] He is described as *tantavāya* and from the description of his activities he is a weaver.[20] In another place a *tunnavāya* or tailor is described as poor (*daḷiddo*) where he attempts to build a house for the monks without the proper material for building and without the proper guidance on how to build it.[21] The cook (*sūda*) is seen in the king's service and receives payment (*vetana*), clothing (*acchādana*) and gratuity (*abhihāra*) for good service.[22]

The last service occupation in our list is that of the *nahāpaka* or the bath attendant. We do not know much about him except the detailed description of his craft.[23] However, he has an assistant (*antevāsi*). This last point is of interest since this is in contrast to the *rajaka* and the *nahāpita* both of whom have *putta* (son) working for or instead of them.

Artisans

In the second category of occupations those of the artisans are, the reed-worker (*naḷakāra*), the potter (*kumbhakāra*), the vehicle-maker (*yānakāra*), the needle-maker (*sucīkāra*), the goldsmith (*suvaṇṇakāra*), the metal smith (*kammāra*), the carpenter (*palagaṇḍa*), the ivory-maker(*dantakāra*), the garland-maker (*mālākāra*) and the

silk producer (*kosiyakāra*).

The *naḷakāra* is a basket-maker, but is to be differentiated from another class of basket-maker, the *veṇa*. His craft is a *sippa*[24] albeit a low one.[25] Unlike the other artisans in the group, the *naḷkāras* have the distinction of living in their own settlement (*naḷakāra gāma*).[26] The story in which this is mentioned also puts forward the possibility of a *naḷakāra* who has never left his settlement. However, the meaning of this statement is not very clear. In another place a monk, committing suicide from the Gijjakūṭa peak near Rājagaha, accidentally falls on a *naḷakāra* and kills him.[27] It may be conjectured from all this that the *naḷakāra* families lived in their own settlements on the border of the cities. With their need for collecting reeds from the forest, they could hardly live in the middle of the other city population without creating a subsidiary occupation of reed-collecting. Of this, however, we find no mention. Our conjecture is, therefore, justified.

The next craftsman is the potter (*kumbhakāra*) who is the most important of all the artisans. His craft consists of making earthenware on the banks of rivers and ponds.[28] The king Ajātasattu identifies the potter's activities as a *sippa.*[29] His occupation is a low *sippa.*[30] He is not a rich man and seems to live solely by his craft. This can be seen from the fact that the monks who take the gift of bowls from him reduce him to a position where his family and occupation (perhaps business) suffers.[31] On the other hand his ritual position is not very low. Dhaniya kumbhakāra is a monk[32] and Ghaṭikāra *kumbhakāra* is a faithful devotee of the Kassapa Buddha.[33] The Buddha Kassapa addresses him as *Bhaggavā*, a term denoting *gotta.* Although he is poor and can offer only rice and curry, he is held in deep affection by the Buddha Kassapa; so much so that the latter declines the king's invitation to spend the rainy season at his residence and prefers instead the Ghaṭikāra, the *kumbhakāra*'s meagre alms. The same*kumbhakāra* addresses a brāhmaṇa youth Jotipāla as *samma*, a term denoting familiarity. He pulls him by the waist and later by the hair when the latter is in a state of ritual purity. One explanation of this behaviour is that he is a favoured and religious devotee of the Buddha Kassapa and that he wants at all cost to

convert Jotipāla in Buddha's faith. We believe, however, that such familiarity and flouting of brāhmaṇa ritual purity cannot be possible if the *kumbhakāra* has a very low ritual position. What is more likely is that the *kumbhakāra*'s ritual position, although low, is perhaps mitigated in some way either because of the antiquity of his craft or because of his historical importance. About this, however, we know nothing but the fact that he is the bearer of the *gotta Bhaggava* which is derived from the name of one of the ten *risis* (sages) mentioned in the text serially.[34] In the text *Bhagu,* from which the *Bhaggava gotta* is derived, is at the lower end of the series. But in the Vedic period he is associated with the Āṅgirasa.[35] In one place the Buddha is compared to an Āṅgirasa.[36]

On another occasion, the Buddha goes to stay in the *kumbhakāra* 's home. On this occasion the potter is referred to as *Bhaggava kumbhakāra* and is so addressed.[37] King Dīghiti of Kāsi, then in hiding, seeks refuge in a *kumbhakāra* 's house only to be betrayed by a barber.[38] The monk Dhaniya, who was formerly a *kumbhakāra* is a man of patience. The women collecting reeds break his hut made of grass and sticks. When this happens he builds one made of earth. He is frustrated even in this effort because a monk may not kill germs in the process of kneading mud. At last he builds a hut made of wood. But even here, he involves himself in trouble with the king. He obtains cut wood from the king's storekeeper (*dārugahagaṇaka*) on the strength of the king's general proclamation that monks may take freely what is not privately owned. He is found misinterpreting the king's proclamation and goes unpunished only because he is a monk.[39]

Of the vehicle-maker (*yānakāra*) we know very little except that he is shown as repairing a felloe of the wheel. Instead of an *antevāsi*, which we find in other crafts, in this context, it is a *yānakāra putta* who does the work.[40]

The fourth artisan is the needle-maker (*sucīkāra*) who is differentiated from the needle-vendor (*sucīvaṇṇija*). [41] This apparently reflects the existence of some trading in needles. *Sucīkāra* must also be differentiated from the needler (*sūcaka*) who presumably uses needles to goad the animals and consequently suffers in hell.[42] The next artisan is the

metal-smith (*kammāra*). In one context, he is the person to whom a man finding a gold ring may go in order to check the worth of it.[43] He is thus identified with *suvaṇṇakāra*, the goldsmith. Cunda, who is a *kammāra putta*, is a rich man owning a mango grove. It was at his place that the Buddha ate his last meal.[44] Cunda's opulence was not unnatural since his craft involved dealing in gold, the most prized metal at that time. In another place a bronze vessel (*kaṃsapāti*) is sold in a smith's shop.[45] He is also shown as a possessor of a family (*kammārakula*); a distinction which is usually reserved for a man of substance or status (except in cases where poverty and low status are contrasted with wealth and high social status).

The *palagaṇḍa* is a carpenter. Apart from the fact that he is so and that he has an assistant (*antevāsi*), we do not know anything about him.[46] The ivory-worker (*dantakāra*) is another craftsman who suffers because the monks take away too many needle cases from him.[47] Like the carpenter, he, too, has an assistant.[48]

The garland-maker's (*mālākāra*) craft is described by the king as a *sippa*. [49] Whether he is an artisan in our sense is doubtful, since the work of the flower-cutter (*puppha-chandaka*) is described as low (*hīna kamma*).[50] Of the last artisan manufacturer, the silk-worker (*kosiyakāra*), only the technique of worm rearing and silk making is indicated. He works against the ritual injunction not to kill in order to support his wife and children.[51]

Professions

For want of a better substitute, we may describe the next group of occupation as professions. Within this group are the occupations of the doctor of medicine (*vejja bhissaka*) and surgery (*sallakata*), and the professions involving writing (*lekhā*), accounting (*gaṇanā*) and money changing (*muddā* or *rupaṃ*).

Of all the occupations, the doctor's profession appears to be socially valued the most. This may be seen from the frequent appreciative mention of activities of the doctor Jīvaka. He is the son of the courtesan Silāvatī and his paternity is unknown.[52] The monk Upāli, formerly a barber, who later became an expert in *Vinaya*, and the physician

Jīvaka are two important persons in the Buddhist society whose status ascribed to them through low birth is not compatible with that achieved by them through their actions. But whereas the barber Upāli is abused at times by the ignorant nuns,[53] Jīvaka does not meet with even a trace of insult. On the contrary at one place he is specifically stated to be one who is "much liked by the people."[54]

About Jīvaka's professional capacities we have a variety of material into which it is unnecessary to go in details.[55] He is not only the best doctor but also one of the chief Buddhist lay devotees[56] who uses his professional activities in order to convert people to the Buddhist way of life.[57] He is the king's physician[58] and a trusted friend of king Ajātasattu of Magadha.[59] It took him seven years of training and a visit to Takkasīlā to become the good doctor that he was.[60] In this connection it is noteworthy that seven years is the ideal period of training; for example, Dabba Mallaputta after seven years of training in the Buddhas doctrine (as a monk) becomes an *arahat*. The Buddha considers him fit to hold a responsible position, that of looking after the lodging and boarding of the Buddhist monks.[61] In contrast to this the pupil of nun Uppalananda, spends seven years in mastering the *dhamma*, but she could not remember it.[62] The only other doctor mentioned by name in the text apart from Jīvaka is Ākāsagotta *vejja*, who performs a surgical operation on a monk. Unlike Jīvaka, he seems to be a brāhmaṇa. He is hostile and even insulting to the Buddha and addresses him in the style of all brāhmaṇa as *bho*. [63] The actual task of an ordinary *bhissaka* or *sallakata* or doctor of medicine or surgery, is described as that of removing poisoned arrows from the body.[64]

Money changing and counting, accounting in general, and writing are identified positively as the only high *sippas* in the text.[65] In a society where intellectual occupations are necessarily the preserve of the few, who only can find the requisite opportunity and capacity, it is natural that such occupations are considered very high, if not the highest. It is for this reason that young Upāli's parents when planning their son's career think of writing (*lekhā*), accounting (*gaṇana*) and money-changing (*rupaṃ*). Yet

almost immediately they come to the conclusion that even these occupations, predominantly intellectual as they are, involve some pain for their young and delicate son. They choose monkhood for him only because they think it does not involve any mental hardships for him and provides all the essential physical comforts, or at least a guaranteed livelihood without manual work.[66] Whatever may be the wisdom of Upāli's parents in their choice of monkhood, there is no doubt that after it (though it is hardly a profession), they considered writing, accounting and dealing in money to be the best of professions.

The Entertainers

The actor (*naṭa*), dancer (*naṭaka*), acrobat (*langhīka*), drummer (*kumbhathunika*), woman fortune-teller (*ikkhaṇīkā*), magician (*sokajjāyika*), courtesan (*gaṇikā*) and common prostitute (*vesī*) are the chief entertainers. The first four of the entertainers showed their arts mainly at fairs (*samāja*),[67] but also at other times and places as well.[68] Although they obviously lived on the spontaneous but conventional or perhaps traditionally prescribed remuneration for their acts from their audience, their position does not seem contemptible in Buddhist society. They have *gāmaṇis* to look after their interests and who also preach the virtues of the *naṭas*' profession. One such *gāmaṇi* asks the Buddha whether it is true that actors if they exert themselves in the performance will be reborn in the *deva* world.[69]

A low caste entertainer (*caṇḍāla vaṃsika*) and his assistant (*antevāsi*),[70] apparently acrobats of a different type, seem to be poorer and socially more inferior. The term literally means born of the *caṇḍāla* lineage and if anything indicates extremely low ritual status. His art is the only one described. It did require some skill and apprenticeship, a fact which is shown by the presence of the assistant. It is a commonplace that at the lowest level of the social hierarchy, the sophisticated rules which differentiate social status in inter-personal behaviour seldom apply. It is perhaps for this reason that we find that the *caṇḍāla vaṃsika* and his assistant address each other as *samma*, a term denoting familiarity which is used by two people of

equal status.[71] It may also be that the physical risk involved in their performance and their mutual interdependence during it may have engendered a feeling of equality.

The courtesan (*gaṇikā*) does not seem to be despised.. They could become nuns.[72] An ex-courtesan (*puraṇa gaṇikā*) does not find great difficulty in getting her daughter married. In the marriage negotiations, she is addressed by her affines *ayye* a term used for a respectable woman.[73]

Ambapāli, the famous courtesan of Vesāli, is the pride of the city, so much so that the local council (*negama*) of Rājagaha finds Silāvatī in order not to fall behind in the reputation which the courtesan brings to a city.[74] Ambapāli is the first to invite the Buddha and the 1250 monks in his entourage for a meal and even refuses to relinquish that privilege in favour of Licchavis of Vesāli for all the wealth of the city. She is obviously rich and has her own chariot. She dedicates an *ārāma* for the order.[75] Yet she does not have an untarnished social status, for Licchavis in their verbal conflict with her over the privilege of being the first to invite the Buddha and his monks for a meal, address her as *je*, a term which is used solely for a *dāsī*, a woman slave.[76] Moreover, however high it may be, she also has a price for her body; fifty coins for a night. Silāvatī, who is a mere shadow of the glamour of Ambapāli, has the misfortune of being pregnant. But she may not keep her child or even publicise the fact of pregnancy and childbirth.[77] Hence she abandons her child. In a society where Visākhā Migāramātā receives her status and dignity through the presence of her many children and grandchildren, the social status and the glamour attaching to a courtesan seem a little hollow.[78]

The common prostitute (*vesī*) by comparison is a more unsophisticated woman and forthright in her activities. When invited through a messenger to a picnic by men she refuses to go to them on the grounds that she does not know what sort of men they are. "I am rich," she says, "and have many ornaments and, therefore, would not go out of the city to meet strangers."[79]

In the ritual context, the fortune-teller (*ikkhaṇikā*) is the most despised woman in Buddhist society. According to

the texts she will go to hell because of her odious and despicable practises.[80] And yet in fact her status may not have been so low. She may have been despised and yet respected overtly through the fear of the supernatural. But on this point we do not have any evidence.

The King's Services

Next we consider various kinds of warriors who are employed in the king's service. These warrior servants are known symbolically through the art of bowmanship (*issithena*) and under the term *yodhājīva* which literally means those who live by fighting battles.[81] Elsewhere they are referred to in greater detail by the king Ajātasattu who described their occupation as *sippa.* [82] They are the elephant riders (*hattārohā*), the cavaliers (*assārohā*), the charioteers (*ratthikā* as distinct from *rathakāra*), archers (*dhanugahā*) standard bearers (*celakā*), billeting officers (*calakā*), supply corps (*piṇḍakāvikā*), fierce warriors (*uggā*), princes (*rājaputtā*), veteran warriors (*pukkhandino*), warriors brave as *nāgas* (*mahānāga*), the heroes (*sūrā*), warriors in buckskin (*cammayodhino*), and body disposers (*kāraṇikā*). It also consisted of the chief of the army (*senāpati*)[83] and the four fold army (*caturaṅga senā*).[84] That this extensive specialisation in war craft was necessary, can be seen from the accounts of several wars which we find in the text.

In contrast to the above there was perhaps an equal degree of specialisation in the king's civil administration. Those who were in the king's service were known as *rājaporisā.* This consisted among others the king or the consecrated *khattiya* (*khattiya muḍḍhāvasatha*), the different ministers (*mahāmaccā*), the territorial governors (*raṭṭhikā*) the estate holder managers (*pettanikā)*, the royal chamberlain(*thāpati)*, elephant trainer-rider (*hattiroha*), cavaliers (*assāroha*), the horse trainers (*assādamaka, assādamaka sārathi*), the policemen (*rāja bhaṭā*), the jailor (*bandhanāgārika*), the village head man (*gāma gāmaṇi, gāmaṇi*), the village overseer (*gāmika*), spies (*carā*), and the messengers (*dutā*), batmen (*khattā*), park-keepers (*ārāmikā*), the store keeper of wood used for the purpose of maintaining fortifications (*dārugaha gaṇaka*), the slaves and their

families (*dāsa, dāsi, dāsakaputta*), personal messengers (*pessā*), and workers (*kammakārā*). Over and above these, there were often a number of service occupations such as the barber, the tailor, the cook and so on, who were in the king's employment.

The importance of the king in the economic sphere evidently lies in the fact that he is the largest single employer of the persons doing the greatest variety of jobs. He may have derived from this fact much of his political power and social prestige. A third important fact is that the king himself and many of his servants fulfilled the managerial and proprietary functions only in the processes of production. They may have provided some capital, but hardly contributed to non-managerial labour.

Coming back to the actual description of the king's servants we find that ministers (*mahāmaccā*) possess the highest degree of power. It is natural, therefore, that there is some division of labour among the ministerial group. In support of this we find that in the text the minister of justice (*vohāramahāmacca*),[85] the treasurer (*gaṇaka mahāmatta*) and the minister of all affairs (*sabbhatthakaṃ mahāmatta*)[86] are mentioned. They possess delegated authority and power, which are as strong as those of the king.

Kammikas, gāmikas and *rājabhaṭas* are the next important group since they interfere directly by influencing the economic activities. *Kammikas* act as customs officers. Thus a caravan from Rājagaha going south intends to evade the tax. *Kammikas* come to know of this plan and they infest the way, seize the caravan and confiscate it.[87] The tax collecting centres of the king have been referred to as situated in a mountain pass or at a ford in a river, or at the gate of a *gāma.*[88] The functions of a *gāmikā*, the overseer of a village, is not specified but these seem to be important ones. He receives personal instructions from the king and seems to have been chosen from leading families. King Bimbisāra had 8,400 *gāmas* and *gāmikas* of equal number to whom he gives instructions.[89] Amongst those who receive instructions is Soṇa, a son of a *seṭṭhi.*[90]

The roads between the big cities were not unfrequented by highwaymen (*corā*). Even the monks who by their professions, follow a money-less creed, are deprived of their

goods and sometimes their lives.[91] The road between Sāketa and Sāvatthi is mentioned as being infested with highwaymen. *Rājabhaṭas* from Sāvatthi catch them, return the stolen goods to the owners and even lead the robbers to execution.[92] The importance of *rājabhaṭas* is recognised by the Buddhist *saṃgha* and it makes it an offence if one were to ordain them.[93] Although *rājabhaṭas* safeguard the property of the people, they are rough in dealing with them and are described as evil men (*dussīle pāpadhamme*).[94] The profession of a *rājabhaṭa* does not seem to be low. We find a brāhmaṇa making his living as a *rājabhaṭa* (*nibbiṭṭharājabhaṭo*). However, he is angry at the behaviour of a nun who accidentally throws rubbish on his head with the result that he is prepared to set fire to the nunnery. This brāhmaṇa receives wages in cash from the king.[95]

Trading and Commercial Activities

Vaṇṇijja is a broader term for commercial or trading activities and is mentioned together with agriculture and cattle-keeping.[96] To earn money through trading was considered very natural. The impact of these activities in the society was felt even by the Buddha. Criticising certain religious mendicants on their mode of thinking, the Buddha says that these maintain that they will be such and such in the next world. "It is as though a trader who has gone out trading (*vāṇijassa vāṇijjāya*) should think, I will have this from there, I will get this from there."[97] In another instance, the monk Sāriputta sets before the Buddha the four probable outcomes for persons engaged in trade (*vaṇijjā payutta*). For some persons either it turns out to be a failure (*chedagāminī hoti*), or does not turn out as intended (*na yathādhippāyā*), or turns out as he intended (*yathādhippāyā*) or there is prosperity beyond his expectation (*parādhippāyā hotiti*). The Buddha explains this phenomena by resorting to the principles of *kamma*, the act and its retribution. He says that a person's prosperity or failure in trade in present life depends on a proportionate ratio as to how much more or less a person offers in his previous life to religious mendicants.[98] In yet another instance, the Buddha compares agriculture to trading. "Agriculture," he says, "is an occupation where

there is a great deal to do, many duties, large administration, great problems , which, if succeeded in, yields great profit." On the other hand trading involves far less duties, administration and problems and yet a successful venture brings in a great profit.[99]

Thus it is not surprising that, along with agriculture and cattle-keeping, the occupation of trading is considered high (*ukkaṭṭha kammaṃ*).[100] However, the Buddhist ethics do not permit an *upāsaka* to undertake certain trades, namely, trade in weapon (*satthavaṇijjā*), trade in human beings (*sattavaṇijjā*), trade in flesh (*maṃsavaṇijjā*), trade in intoxicants (*majjavaṇijjā*) and trade in poisons (*visavaṇijjā*).[101] The need to classify trades as bad obviously arises out of Buddhist considerations not to hurt human beings, nevertheless, it testifies to the prevalence of certain trades. A brāhmaṇa, a *gahapati* or even a member of an extended kin-group could follow this occupation. Thus in his advice to the brāhmaṇa Ujjaya the Buddha expects *kulaputtas* to follow anyone of these vocations that of trading, cattle-keeping and agriculture.[102] Similar advice is given to Dīghajānu Koḷiyaputta, a member of the ruling extended kin-group.[103] A *gahapati* or a *gahapati-putta* also, as we shall see elsewhere, engages himself with trading or commercial activities.[104]

Trade by Water

We have several references to trade by land but the evidence to support sea trade is also not altogether lacking. The Buddha talks of sea merchants who, on their voyage, take with them a bird to sight land (*tīradassiṃ sakuṇaṃ gahetvā*). When the ship is out of sight of land they free the bird which flies all round the ship. And if the bird sights land nearby it goes away for good; but if it sees no land, it returns to the ship.[105]

In another instance we find a sea going ship (*sammuddikāya nāvā*) rigged with a mast which is beached on the shore for the winter. Affected by wind, rain and heat, the hull of the ship weakens and rots away, if not properly looked after.[106] Although the term *samudda* generally refers to sea it may also mean a large river, for instance the Gangā.[107] In this connection we may note that the

geographical limits of *Majjhima janapada* do not include any sea ports of western or eastern India.[108] We find virtually no reference to sea ports in our texts.

Trade by Land

Trade by land was evidently more common than trade by sea. We find many land routes between the cities referred to in the text. The information we get of these routes is likely to be precise and perhaps accurate for the Buddha, his monks and his followers would most likely traverse the same roads which the traders long since had been following. Jīvaka, the physician, was indeed a widely travelled man. He gets his education at Takkasīlā. He goes to Sāketā from there and ultimately returns to Rājagaha. From Rājagaha he is sent to Banaras on the king's summons to cure a *seṭṭhi*. To cure king Pajjota of Avanti he goes to Ujjaini via Kosāmbi.[109] From Sāvatthi the *gahapati* Anāthapiṇḍika goes to Rājagaha where he stays in his brother-in-law's place.[110] He also has a *kammata gāma* (business estate) in Kāsi.[111] The merchants from Ukkala, Tappussa and Bhallika, while they were on their way to Banaras, see the Buddha and give him food.[112] But the most travelled man of all, as it appears from the texts, was the Buddha himself. Sāvatthi and Rājagaha were his more or less headquarters from where he used to go to a number of places, which are faithfully recorded in the texts. We may mention here one of his journeys, which took him to Kusināra from Rājagaha. He started from Rājagaha and, from there he went to Ambalaṭṭhikā---Nālanda---Pāṭaḷigāma--Koṭigāma--Nādikā--Vesāli--Bhaṇḍagāma---Hatthigāma---Ambagāma---Jambugāma---Bhoganagara---Pāvā---Kusināra.[113]

People also travelled in caravans. We find caravans with 1,000 carts going from one *janapada* to another and which had to pass through deserted areas.[114] A caravan halting more than four months has been designated as a *gāma*.[115] Also a caravan road is referred to in the *Vinaya*.[116] A monk can spend his full rainy season with a caravan.[117] Caravans had to pay taxes to king's men and thus were a source of income to the king.[118]

Besides these references to caravans, we find carts full of

goods going from one place to another. One such group of 500 carts is mentioned as passing by a stream, where the Buddha was meditating.[119] The Buddha was once journeying from Andhakovinda to Rājagaha. On the way he met Belaṭṭha Kaccāna who was going towards Andhakovinda with 500 wagons, all filled with jars of sugar.[120] The point to note here is that Belaṭṭha was going from Rājagaha (a city) to Andhakovinda (a town). He is presumably a sugar dealer, selling sugar in the countryside. Merchants from distant lands come to sell their goods in *Majjhima janapada.* Thus horse dealers from Uttarāpatha come to Verañja with 500 horses.[121] Within the broader region of *Majjhima janapada* certain economic products were known by the region in which they were manufactured, for example, the products of Kāsi, such as Kāsi cloth and Kāsi sandalwood.[122] The bronze dishes of Kosala (*kosālika kaṃsapāti*) also seem to have been popular as the term was used in a metaphor where it was compared with the shining eyes of a serpent king.[123]

Small Traders

Under this heading we include shopkeepers who sell all sorts of merchandise including meat and wine. In the *Vinaya* a group of nuns who practised the following trades are prohibited to do so in future. They set up a tavern (*pānāgāraṃ ṭhapenti*), a slaughter house (*sūnaṃ ṭhapenti*), offered things for sale in a shop (*āpaṇaṃ pasārenti*), engaged in usury (*vaḍḍhiṃ payojenti*), engaged in trade (*vaṇijjaṃ payojenti*) and dealt in greens and leaves (*harīta kapaṇṇkaṃ pakiṇanti*).[124] It is significant to note from this that women could occupy themselves with this petty trading. What is prohibited for nuns can be allowed those women outside the nunnery. Also the term *vaṇijja* is differentiated from setting up a shop or engaging in usury. In another instance, the nuns made a hoard of many bowls. People saw this and questioned, "Will these nuns do a trade in bowls (*patta vaṇijjaṃ karessanti*) or will they set up an earthenware shop (*āmattikepaṇaṃ pasāressantīti*)."[125] In this and previous passage *vaṇijja* is separated from setting up of a shop. However, the considerable accumulation of goods is the perquisite for both. The

probable explanation to this is that *vaṇijja* or trading refers to wholesale transactions of goods and setting up of a shop indicates retail selling of goods.

The shopkeeper (*pāpaṇiko*), it is said, must have three characteristics, shrewdness, capability and the ability to inspire confidence, in which case in a short time he becomes wealthy. "This article, brought for so much and sold for so much, will bring in so much money, such and such profit." That is how he is shrewd. He is clever at buying and selling goods. He becomes known to the rich *gahapatis* or *gahapatiputtas*. They make him offers of money.[126] In his skill in raising finance, buying and selling things this shopkeeper seems to resemble a modern *entrepreneur* and the *gahapatis* or *gahapatiputtas* who give him loans appear similar to modern bankers.

The shrewdness of the shopkeeper is again seen in the *Vinaya*.[127] An *upāsaka*, having bought ghee for a *kahāpaṇa* from the house of a certain shopkeeper, gives it to nun Thullananda. Thullananda says that she is in need of oil and not of ghee. The *upāsaka* goes to the shopkeeper and tells him to give in exchange the oil for the ghee. The shopkeeper replies: "If we take back again goods that were bought, when will our goods be sold? Ghee was taken owing to the purchase of ghee; give money for the purchase of oil and you shall take oil." The existence of such business ethics, however crude, shows the transition from barter economy to an established monetary economy in big cities like Sāvatthi where the incident took place, if nowhere else.

The social status of persons who sold meat, at least in the eyes of the Buddhist writers, does not seem high. The killing of animals is considered a cruel occupation (*kurūrakammanta*).[128] The Buddha says that a fisherman who sells his fish will remain poor here and hereafter.[129] A butcher suffers in hell.[130]

Agriculture and Cattle-keeping

In a peasant society where agriculture is the most important productive source it is but natural for people of diverse social groups to participate in this activity. Mahānāma Sākya describes to his younger brother Anuruddha the

duties incumbent on a person who is engaged in agricultural activities. The entire agricultural operations from ploughing the field to winnowing the chaff and separating the grains have been described by Mahānāma. "The operations," Mahānāma explains to his brother, "do not stop, they are unending. Even when our fathers and grandfathers passed away the operations were not stopped." Mahānāma was a member of the ruling extended kin group, and it is most likely that he would be performing only managerial and proprietary functions in his ancestral farm. The income from his farm must have been substantial so as to be able to let his younger brother live in luxury (*sukhumālo*), and also therefore must indicate a big land holding.[131]

We find the Mallas of Kusināra referring to their *gāma khetta* (agricultural lands).[132] Dīghajānu Koḷiyaputta is told amongst others about this occupation of *kasi* (agriculture) which a young man could follow.[133] We find brāhmaṇa farmer Bhāradvāja ploughing his land, which requires 500 ploughshares. Proudly he says to the Buddha that he ploughs, sows and eats. Perhaps Bhāradvāja wanted to imply from this statement that the Buddha was incapable of doing constructive work such as agriculture.[134] A *kassaka gahapati* tends his *sāḷi* -rice farm with great care in order to reap a rich harvest.[135] When Meṇḍaka the *gahapati*'s slave ploughs with one ploughshare seven furrows miraculously come from it.[136] We find two farmer brothers who, while ploughing the land, are struck by lightning and consequently die along with their four oxen.[137] In this instance, we may note that ploughing is carried by free men farmers and not by a slave as in the earlier case. In another instance we find a brāhmaṇa farmer experiencing bad days. His seasamum farm has gone bad, leaving only one or two stalks of seasamum. His farm is empty and he is deeply in debts.[138] *Kasi* (agriculture) is considered a high vocation.[139] Whenever these three occupations–agriculture, trading and cattle-keeping–are mentioned, agriculture is always given precedence over the others.[140] We have mentioned earlier that according to the Buddha agriculture requires elaborate preparations.[141]

In the *Vāseṭṭha Sutta*, one who lives by cattle-keeping

(*gorakkhaṃ upajīvati*) is called a *kassaka* (a farmer).[142] This may have been so since both the vocations are connected with food producing activities. However, cattle-keeping for some at least seems to have been a specialized vocation. Gopaka Moggalāna brāhmaṇa and Dhaniya are the two examples in point. Both of them make their living by keeping cattle.[143]

Gahapati

I.B. Horner renders the *Vinaya* definition of *gahapati* as "he who lives in a house" (*yo koci agāraṃ ajjhāvasati*).[144] The term *ajjhāvasati* however, has the distinct sense of ownership and control. Thus king Bimbisāra rules (*ajjhāvasati*) over Kāsi–Kosala.[145] The brāhmaṇa Lohicca has ownership rights over Sālavaṭika (*Sālavaṭikaṃ ajjhāvasati*) and also he has many persons dependent on him for their livelihood.[146] Brāhmaṇa Soṇadaṇḍa and brāhmaṇa Canki are also owners of the lands donated to them by the kings.[147] A king is informed of a rich country which he could attack, conquer and rule over (*ajjhāvaseyyāmiti*).[148]

In the light of above meanings of the term *ajjhāvasati*, which denotes ownership rights, it is most likely that the definition of *gahapati* given in the *Vinaya* refers not so much to "one who lives in a house" but to one who has the full ownership rights of the household. The term *gahapati* is thus applied to a household head. In this it corresponds to its meaning as found in Vedic texts.[149] Also *gahapati* has to bear the full responsibility of the household. A *gahapati* according to the *Aṅguttara*, has to preserve a sacred fire (*gahapatiaggi*).[150]

A *gahapati* had to hand over the responsibilities to his successors before his retirement. Poṭaliya *gahapati* says that he has handed over to his sons as their inheritance, all that he had of his property and has now retired from the active participation in the day-to-day affairs. This idea of giving up is denoted by the word "*vohārasamucchedaṃ*."[151] Buddha says that a *gahapati* or *gahapatiputta* , to become a monk, has to forsake his fortune, small or great, and his circle of extended kin group, however few or many, and don the yellow robe.[152] He has thus to cleave all

secular ties.

But this is not the only sense in which the term *gahapati* is used. The *Vinaya* gives another definition of the word. It says, "Excepting the king and he who is in the king's service, and the brāhmaṇa, he who remains is called a *gahapati* "[153] But this definition is also contradicted by the actual use in which the term has been used in the text. Thus we find the existence of brāhmaṇa gahapatis.

With respect to the king's servants and the *khattiyas* (the ruling extended kin groups), the term *gahapati* is associated with them never as a term of reference to an individual. They are included in a broad scheme of classification. Thus in the *Saṃyutta* and *Aṅguttara Nikāyas*, under the subsection of the *gahapati* (*gahapati vagga*) following are mentioned:(1) Rājā Udena, (2) Soṇa *gahapatiputta*, (3) Ghosita *gahapati*, (4) Upāli *gahapati*, (5) Ugga *gahapati* of Hatthigāma, (6) a *gahapati* of Haliddika, (7) Nakulapitā *gahapati*, (8) Lohicca brāhmaṇa, (9)Veracchāni brāhmaṇi, (10) Ugga *gahapati* of Vesāli, (11) Hatthaka of Āḷavi, (12) Mahānāma Sākya, and (13) Jīvaka Komārabhacca.[154] However this scheme of classification is not applied in actual practise. Thus it can be said that the term *gahapati* is not generally applied to *khattiyas* and king's servants. The general application of this term appears to be to persons whose growing wealth and influence marks them out as separate from their extended kin groups. We see this borne out in the following examples, which also give us a number of characteristics of the persons labelled *gahapatis*. We have seen earlier in our Chapter III, that the term *gahapati* is much used as a mode of addressing such people.

We may give here the case of Meṇḍaka *gahapati*. He is a resident of Bhaddiya Nagara. Meṇḍaka and his family are known for their eminence in psychic power. All Meṇḍaka has to do is to wash his head and sweep his granary so that, as a result of his psychic power, soon a shower of grain will fall down and fill the granary. Sitting down besides only one bowl of the capacity of an *āḷaka* measure and one helping of curry and condiments, his wife serves food to his household employees (*dāsa kammakāra porisaṃ*). Not until she gets up is it exhausted. His son, using only one purse containing a thousand coins, gives six months wages

(*chammāsikaṃ vetanaṃ*) to each of his employees. His daughter-in-law provides food for six months wages in kind (*bhattaṃ*) to the employees of Meṇḍaka, only by sitting next to one basket of the capacity of *doṇa* measure. Lastly, when the slave of Meṇḍaka *gahapati* ploughs with one ploughshare seven furrows come from it. Meṇḍaka feeds the king's entire army and gives them wages in kind and in cash and also orders 1250 cowherds (*gopālikā)* to give fresh milk to the Buddha and his *saṃgha.*[155]

The description of Meṇḍaka and his family, although very unusual and improbable, symbolises his role as tax-giver–he pays the king's army wages–as donor–he institutes 1250 cowherds to serve the Buddha and his *saṃgha.* Above all, we are struck by the affluence of this *gahapati.* Indeed, it is for his role as a producer of wealth that he and his family is characterised. It is noteworthy that Meṇḍaka is not referred to as a *seṭṭhi gahapati* and from the description of psychic powers and from the nature of his gifts to the Buddha, his occupation is connected with agriculture and cattle keeping and he is not purely a trader. Also in their relationship with others, the whole household of Meṇḍaka seems to act as a unit.

There are a number of other *gahapatis* who are known in the text for their affluence. Anāthapiṇḍika, though not in the possession of psychic power, yet is capable of paying a fabulous price for Jetavana, a plot of land which he donates to the Buddha.[156] His brother-in-law, a *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Rājagaha, prepares a huge meal for the Buddha. Anāthapiṇḍika, on seeing this, mistakes it for a meal prepared for a marriage ceremony, or a big sacrifice or for the king and his army.[157] When Anāthapiṇḍika intends to give a meal to the Buddha, the king, as well as the urban Council (*negama*) of Rājagaha show their willingness to help him in doing so.[158]

To physician Jīvaka, a *gahapati* of Sāketa gives 16,000 coins, a male and a female slave and a horse chariot. We may note here that *gahapati* his son, wife and his daughter-in-law, each contributed to this reward.[159] In another instance a *gahapati* of Banaras has to give 16,000 for curing his son.[160] While another *seṭṭhi gahapati* of Rājagaha, for his brain operation, presents 100,000 coins to the king and

100,000 toJīvaka.[161] When a *seṭṭhi gahapati* dies without any heir to the property, king Pasenadi gets a very substantial amount in gold and silver.[162]

Gahapati is mentioned as one of the seven jewels of the king. This jewel of *gahapati* draws gold from the midst of the Gangā and gives it to him.[163] This incidence of giving gold to the king is supposedly a symbolic representation of the *gahapati* 's ability to give to the king taxes in kind or in cash. *Gahapati* Dasama of Aṭṭhaka Nagara gives Ānanda many robes and a building for the monastery which was worth 500 coins.[164] As a financier, *gahapati* lends money to promising shop-keepers.[165] The brāhmaṇa Dhānañjāni exploits *gahapatis* and kings by setting each against the other and thus makes his living.[166] The men are covetous of *gahapati* 's wealth, and wish him harm and he has to keep a strong bodyguard to defend himself.[167] Also slaves and labourers are envious of his position. [168]

In the *Aṅguttara Nikāya,* it is affirmed that acquisition of money (*bhogādhippāyā*) and the search of knowledge (*paññupavicāra*), mentioned in that order of preference, are the shared goals of the *khattiya*, brāhmaṇa and *gahapati* classes. In addition, to achieve excellence in his avocation is the *gahapati's* determination (*sippādhiṭṭhānā*); to engage in an enterprise is his need (*kammantābhinivesā*) and; to carry to fruition his enterprise is his aim (*niṭṭhakammanta pariyosānā*).[169]

In the light of our description of the occupational divisions developed within a largely urban setting and the role of the *gahpatis* within it (mentioned in this chapter as well as in other chapters), we may ask: Why did the Buddha's teachings hold such a wide appeal for his lay followers? What was there in his teachings that his lay followers found relevant to their mode of livelihood and thinking? Did the Buddha propound a monetary ideology specifically geared to the needs of the rising *gahapati* class? The answers to all these questions are: the Buddha, as far as it can be gleaned from the *Nikāya* and *Vinaya* texts, did expound on the subject of money; how to earn it legitimately, spend it and use it effectively to accumulate this-worldly and other-worldly gains.

The Concept of Bhoga

The most frequently used term for money in the texts is *bhoga*, although we do find the terms *dhana* , *aṭṭha* and *aḍḍha* used in a similar sense. The Pāli dictionary derives its meaning from the root *bhuñj* to make use of, take advantage of, and to eat.[170] The term *bhoga*, when mentioned in conjunction with *kāma*, to form the word *kāmabhoga*, means enjoyment of sensual pleasure [171] The connotation of *bhoga* to eat or consume is also present in the usage of the term where it is used as synonym for cash; like pleasures of senses, money is to be consumed.

The term *dhana* is occasionally associated with *bhoga*, although there is a distinction made between the two terms. It is said of Migāra.Rohaṇeyya in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* that he is rich (*aḍḍho*), of great *dhana*, and great *bhoga* (*mahādhano, mahābhogo*). Of gold there is a hundred hundred thousand (*sataṃ satasahassānaṃ*); of silver who can tell. But that *dhana* is subject to the hazards of fire, water, kings, robbers and ill disposed heirs.[172] Even the great robber is mentioned as rich (*aḍḍho*) with great *dhana* and *bhoga.*[173] The anointed *khattiya* rājā is described as rich with great *dhana* and possessing treasuries and granaries which overflow (*paripuṇṇakosakoṭṭhāgāro*).[174] In former times brāhmaṇas accumulated (*sannidhiṃ*) neither *dhana*, grain, silver nor gold.[175] The term *dhana* in the above cases connotes accumulated wealth or property which has to be conserved. The term *bhoga*, as stated above, and as can be adduced from the examples which will be discussed below, refers to the concept of money, cash or liquid assets.

Concerning the general attributes of money (*bhoga*), it is remarked that it is the power of luck which draws money (*bhoga*) to itself.[176] Money (*bhoga*) is listed among ten things desirable, much esteemed and delightful but hard to secure in this world (*iṭṭhā kantā manāpā dullabhā lokasamiṃ*). The other nine things being beauty, health, virtues, the life of continence, friends, truths, understanding, *dhamma* and heaven.[177] Sloth and non-exertion are impediments to acquiring money (*alassaṃ anuṭṭhānaṃ bhogānaṃ paripatho*), whereas energetic strivings are

inducive to its acquisition.[178] Woman is utterly without charm, if she lacks beauty, money (*bhoga*), morality, diligence and the ability to bear children.[179] Possessed of five powers(*balāni*), women dwell at home in confidence: the power of beauty, the power of money (*bhoga*), kin group, sons and the power of virtue.[180]

The pursuit of money, lawfully acquired, is a legitimate goal for people. In his advise to the famous *gahapati* Anāthapiṇḍika the Buddha states that there are four cherished but difficult conditions to secure in this world. "What four? Let money (*bhoga*) by lawful means come to me. Obtaining possession of money [in this manner] (*bhoge laddhā*), let good report attend me along with my kinfolks and teachers. Money in my posession, may I live longer and reach advanced age. Money in my possession, when I die may I attain heaven."[181] Money brings happiness. There are two kinds of happiness. One is the happiness due to money (*bhoga sukhaṃ*) which is obtained by enjoying one's money lawfully acquired (*dhammaladdhehi bhoge*), and with it doing meritorious deeds. This type of consumption of money (*bhoga*) is the best of its kind. For one has the happiness of real ownership of money (*atthi sukhaṃ bhoge me atthi*). The second is the happiness due to debtlessness (*anaṇa sukhaṃ*), further described as "the feeling one gets when one knows that no debt is owed, great or small, to any one."[182]

Money should be sought after by lawful means (*dhammena bhoge pariyesati*) without harm to others (*asāhāsena*). A person should make use of his money (*bhoga*) without greed, longing, without infatuation, watchful of the dangers arising out of money, (*bhoga*) and alive to his well-being.[183] Money (*bhoga*) obtains legitimacy in the eyes of the Buddhist writers only when it is properly gained and put to use in a manner beneficial to society. As the Buddha explains to Anāthapiṇḍika:

> There are five good reasons for possessing money (*bhogānaṃādiya*). The lay disciple (*ariyasāvaka*) with money (*bhoga*) got by energetic striving, gathered by strength of arm, earned by sweat (*sedāvakkhittehi*), lawful (*dhammikehi*), and lawfully acquired (*dhamma*

laddhehi), makes himself happy and cheerful, and he makes his parents, wife, children, his slaves and labourers happy. This is the first reason for acquiring money. Second, he makes his friends and acquaintance (*mittāmacce*) happy. Third, he makes himself secure against misfortunes such as may happen by way of fire, water, kings, robbers, and ill disposed heirs (*appiyato vā dāyādato*). Fourth, he is able to give a share (*bali*) to his kinfolks, to his guests, to his ancestors (*pubbapetabaliṃ*), to the king and to the gods. Fifth, from the Buddhist point of view, perhaps more important, with the money he is able to institute offerings for the deserving *samaṇas* (mendicants) and brāhamaṇas who abstain from inertness and negligence. His bonus: after death he attains heaven.[184]

We find the Buddha further elaborating on the question of the loss of hard earned and lawfully acquired money by the *ariya sāvaka* (lay disciple):

> If the *ariya sāvaka*'s money ran out (*bhogā parikkhayaṃ gacchanti*) without fulfilling the duties and obligations encumbered on him, then the money (*bhoga*) spent in such a manner is called: "Money (*bhoga*) that has failed to seize its opportunity (*aṭṭhānagatā*), failed to acquire merit, (*apattagatā*) and unfittingly used(*anāyatanaso*)." On the other hand, if the same disciple were to distribute his money in doing meritorious deeds then that money (*bhoga*) would be deemed as spent in a proper and fitting manner, accruing points of merit for him. A person firmly rooted in the *ariya dhamma* (the Buddha's teaching) is extolled in this world; and afterwards he rejoices in heaven. The lay diciple should, thus, contemplate on the task well accomplished: I have enjoyed (*bhutta*, literally consumed and eaten) my money (*bhogā*). Those serving me and those dependent on me have been freed from dangers. I have made the best of gifts (*dakkhiṇā*). I have nurtured the virtuous, the composed and the renouncers who lead a good path (*brahmacarayo*). I have gained money (*bhoga*) which the wise householders strive to secure. I have done

deed never to be regretted.[185]

Money (*bhoga*) is compared to cool lake, useless in a desert, but useful near a town or a village for its use for the people staying in them. If the money (*bhoga*) is not properly utilized (*aparibhuñjamāno*, literally not consumed,. not eaten) then it is sequestered by kings or stolen by robbers, or is destroyed by fire or floods or appropriated by unpleasant heirs. Thus *bhoga* that is not properly used runs to waste, not to proper consumption.[186] It is evident from the above examples that the Buddhist writers wanted to inculcate a positive attitude towards money among their lay followers. The attitude was geared to spending money for stabilizing the key elements of society consisting of family and household units, kinship groups and religious orders. The writers insisted that the lawfully acquired money was needed for discharging the political, social, economic and religious obligations and duties required of a householder.

The Buddhist texts in keeping with their desire to enhance the well-being of their lay constituency, offer them advise on how to regulate their financial matters. In his famous advice to a *gahapati* 's son Sigāla, the Buddha says that one should amass money (*bhoga*) by correct means, like bees would while gathering honey from flowers. One should divide money (*bhoga*) in four portions. One portion of money should be designated for personal consumption (*ekena bhoge bhuñjeyya*). One should keep two portions for conducting one's business. The fourth portion should be kept in reserve, for one might need it in times of difficulty.[187]

The Buddha in his discourse to Dīghajānu Koḷiyaputta and the brāhmaṇa Ujjaya explained his model of a "balanced life (*samājīvitā*)" for a *kulaputta* (householder belonging to a respectable lineage). In an earlier passage the Buddha had explained to both the persons above that the money (*bhoga*) had to be obtained by a *kulaputta* using lawful means and striving for it deligently. A *kulaputta* sensing "this much money (*bhoga*) is brought in and this much money (*bhoga*) is expended," should continue to lead a balanced life (*samaṃ jīvikaṃ kappeti)*, not unduly elated or depressed. He should think: "After deducting the loss,

my income will stand at so much, and my outgoings will not exceed my income." He should be knowledgeable like a master of weights (*tulādhāro*) and his apprentice (*tulā-Odhāro antevāsī*) who know, on holding up the balance (*tulaṃ*), that either by so much it has dipped down or by so much it has tilted up. If this *kulaputta*, has but a trifling earnings and lives on a grand scale, it will be said of him: "This *kulaputta* eats his money (*bhoge khādattī*) like a fig-tree glutton." If his earnings are great and he lives meanly, report will say of him: "This *kulaputta* will die like a starveling."[188]

In the passage following the above one, the Buddha elucidates on the four outlets for the flowing away (*cattāri apāyamukhāni*) of amassed money (*bhoga*). Those four are: womanising, habitual drinking, compulsive gambling and friendship, companionship ånd intimacy with the evil. The four inlets for the flowing in (*cattāri āyamukhāni*) of money (*bhoga*) are: abstinence from doing the above three things and cultivating friendship, companionship and intimacy with the good.[189]

Only with sustained hard work and enterprising spirit one can generate money, increase it and spend it wisely. There are three kinds of persons (*puggalā*): the blind (*andho*), the one-eyed (*ekacakkhu*) and two-eyed (*dvicakkhu*). The blind has not the eye to acquire money (*bhoga*) as yet attained or to make the money (*bhoga*) he has increase. He is unable to distinguish bad from good, worthy from unworthy. He is unlucky. The one-eyed-man, ignoring right or wrong searches for money (*bhoga*). With tricks, frauds and lies, but endowed with worldly cleverness, he is successful in gaining money (*bhoga*). But when he dies he suffers in hell (*niraya*). The two-eyed is the best (*seṭṭhaṃ*) among the lot. He acquires money (*bhoga*) with determination and by rightful means and gives it away in charity. Stay away (*parivajjaye*), warns the text, from the blind and the one-eyed, but mingle with the two-eyed man.[190] The meaning of the above passage seems to indicate that naivete is not the prerequisite for the acquisition of money. That money can be earned by unethical means, but such means have unpleasant consequences in this and afterlife. That the best way to go about

making money is to acquire it lawfully by remaining alert and discriminating. Having secured it, there is a need to distribute some of it in charity. The very same message concerning acquisition and spending of money rightfully was conveyed by the Buddha to the *gahapatī* Anāthapiṇḍika in the *upāsaka vagga* of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya.* [191]

But the idle talk about money is frowned upon by people. A man quite poor should prate of wealth (*dalidddo vā samāno aḍḍavādaṃvadeyya*); one lacking possession should prate of possession (*adhano dhanavādaṃvadeyya*); and one without money should prate of money (*abhogavā bhogavādaṃ vadeyya*), and when a time comes to acquire wealth, possession and money, he fails to do so.[195] In yet another telling instance, a man borrows money (*yācitakaṃ bhogaṃ yā citvā*), and with it, a handsome carriage, costly jewels and earrings and parades in the market place. People may observe him and say of him that he must be a monied man for only the men with money can consume money in that fashion (*bhogī vata evaṃ kir bhogino bhogāni bhuñjantīti*). However, the owners of those borrowed things if they see him thus will expose him of his borrowed splendour.[193]

Entrepreneurial skills are admired in the texts, for they help generate money (*bhoga*). A shopkeeper (*pāpaṇiko*), it is stated, is incapable of acquiring money (*bhoga*) which he had not before, of holding the money (*bhoga*) which he gets or increasing the money (*bhoga*) which he holds. This is so because the shopkeeper does not attend closely to the business (*kammanta*), during morning, noon and in the evening. On the other hand, a shopkeeper who is shrewd, capable and skilled can inspire confidence in the *gahapatis* who would willingly support his business. They say of him, "This shopkeeper is shrewd, is capable and resourceful and competent to support his sons and wife and from time to time pay back money (*bhoga*)." They make offers of money (*bhogehi nimantanti*) saying, "Take this money and multiply it (*ito bhoge karitvā*)." The shopkeeper who is thus helped, acquires much money (*bhoga*) in due course of time.[192] The *Dīgha Nikāya* observes that if a man should start an enterprise (*kammante payojeyya*) after contracting

a loan (*iṇaṃ ādāya*), and if his business should succeed, he should not only be able to pay off the original debt he had incurred, but there should be surplus for maintaining a wife.[193] In the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, we find a cleaver and energetic person who starts earning half a *kahāpaṇa* (a coin) in some business or other gradually comes to a state whereby he begins to earn 50 *kahāpaṇas* a day. Thereafter earning 100 and 1000 *kahāpaṇas*, and saving what he got he amasses a vast amount of money (*mahataṃ bhoga-khandhaṃ adhigacceyā*).[194] Commercial activities from the above three passages seems to have been chiefly responsible for building up of monetary resources.

In an acquisitive society, the Buddhist writers articulate their awareness of the imbalance and disparity of wealth found within it. They were cynical enough to observe the grim social and economic reality of their environment; the reality that money can subvert justice and that lack of it can result in an abject humiliation of a person. A certain person has to go to prison for theft of a half a *kahāpaṇa*, a *kahāpaṇa* or a hundred *kahāpaṇas*. Another person does not have to go to prison, though he steals the same amount. This is because, comments the Buddha, the former is a poor person (*daḷiddo*) with little money (*appabhogo*), while the other person is rich (*aḍḍho*) and has lots of money (*mahābhogo*).[195]

In the second instance, it is said that one of the attributes of a great robber (*mahācoro*) is that he is the one who influences people by giving them money (*bhoga cāgī*). How so? Because he is rich (*aḍḍho*) and has plenty of money (*mahābhogo*), he thinks,"Should any one question (*vakkhati*) me, I shall make him friendly from now on by giving him money (*ito bhogena paṭisantharissāmī*)." If anyone does question him, he acts in this manner. Pursuing such a course, the robber breaks into houses, makes off with plunder, makes for lonely houses or lies in wait in the highway.[196]

Commenting on poverty and wealth, the *Vinaya* with its usual cryptic manner observes: "Life is wretched (*pāpakaṃ nāma jīvitaṃ*). The life of the poor (*daḷiddānaṃ jīvitaṃ*) is wretched compared to the life of the rich(*aḍḍhānaṃ*); of the unwealthy (*adhanānaṃ*) is wretched compared to the

life of the wealthy (*sadhanānaṃ*); the life of the human beings (*manussānaṃ*) is wretched compared to the life of the gods (*devānaṃ*)."[197] A poor man, needy and in straits, borrows. When the bill falls due, he does not pay and creditors press for money. And they bind him and put him in jail.[198] However, it might be added here that the Buddhists would not allow anyone to become a monk unless that person cleared his debts first before joining the order.[199]

In a rare social commentary concerning the relationship between the social responsibility and relative freedom from it due to acquisition of money, the Buddha gives a case of a poor man with an ugly wife, run-down hovel and with little or no stash of grain. That wretched fellow might see a monk in a monastry. This monk is sitting in the cool shade about to meditate on higher thoughts. He has just washed his hands and feet and has had a delectable meal. It might occur to that wretched man, "Indeed, monkhood is pleasant and healthy, suppose I should go forth from home into homelessness." But he is not able to, adds the Buddha, to give up his present condition, his ugly wife etc., because for him it is a strong bond, like a thick log of wood which does not rot away. As opposed to this poor man, the Buddha presents a case of a rich *gahapati* or *gahapatiputta*. The *gahapati* or *gahapatiputta* sees the monk in exactly the same manner in which the poor man had seen him earlier and thinks of joining the *saṃgha*. He might be able to bring himself to give up his ample gold ornaments, his money (*boga*) and property. Because for him this is a weak bond that rots away.[200]

As a great teacher who had given up his householder's life in search of *nibbāṇa*, the Buddha's ultimate rejection of money (*bhoga*) for himself is self evident. Others too, who joined his order as monks and nuns had to abandon the whole mass of money, however little or great (*appaṃ vā bhoga khandhaṃ pahāya mahantaṃ vā bhoga khandhaṃ*). In the final analysis, the money is not conduciye to happiness. The Buddha once asked: "Even if a person were to accumulate vast amount of money (*mahantaṃ bhogakhandaṃ*), would that person, because of his money (*bhoga hetu*), on account of his money (*bhoga nidānaṃ*), as a result of his money (*bhogā adhikaraṇaṃ*), be totally happy

for a single night, or a single day or even half a night or half a day?" He receives the answer in the negative. Because, it is stressed in the passage, such cravings for money are impermanent, without substance, and false.[201]

In his sermon to the monks, the Buddha says that the loss of such thing as money (*bhoga*) is a trifling matter. The loss of wisdom brings in utter misery (*paññā parihāni*).[202] The Buddha, in yet another instance, shows his concern about the monks who may accumulate money (*bhoga*) and feast on such accumulated money (*bhoga*).[203] That this fear appears to have been justified could be seen from the pleas made by monks' relatives, friends and even kings, asking them to return to the householder's status. They say to a monk: "Come, monk, why should these yellow robes torment you? Why do you parade about with shaven head and bowl? Return to the lower plane of life. Enjoy the use of money (*bhoga*) and do deeds of merit."[204]

The monks were not allowed in the Theravāda tradition to own houses, fields, cattle, the touch of gold or silver and engage in trade. They neither took part in production nor exercised the least control over the means of production. Their non-competitiveness, as Kosambi observes, may have given them a competitive edge over the demanding brāhmaṇa priesthood.[205] But this very strategy may have exacerbated their dependence on the welfare doled out by the host society. The Buddhist order for their survival had to depend solely on gifts (*dāna*) bestowed on them by their lay followers. The principle of gift-giving (*dāna*) is often emphasised in the Buddhā's teachings to his lay followers. When a gift (*dāna*) is given with faith it ripens and results in great increase of money (*bhoga*) and property for the giver. Moreover, the giver's children, wives and servants listen to him delightedly and serve him faithfully.[205] Gift giving (*dāna*) is specially conducive to reaching heaven. By giving gift (*dāna*) to the future Buddha, a person is born seven times to the heavenly world.[207] Even among the close followers of the Buddha there is distinction made between a follower who practises giving gift (*dāna*) and the one who does not. The followers alike in faith, virtue and insight, after death, are reborn in the happy heaven. But the disciple who is a giver, when he becomes

god, surpasses the non-giver god in five ways: in divine life-span, beauty, happiness, honour and power.[208]

Summing up, the Buddha's teachings to his lay followers, many of whom were urban, and members of the rich, powerful and rising *gahapati* class, addressed their economic, social and ethical concerns. The Buddha's message to them was clear that their success and happiness in life, to a large extent depended on possessing money, consuming it, conserving it and actively participating in its acquisition. Poverty was not a virtue to be cultivated. A concomitant message was that success in generating money depended on self reliance, hard work, diligence and enterprising spirit. To engage in commercial activities was a good method of making money. The Buddha, equally and strongly, stressed that money had to be earned by lawful and moral means and its possession brought with it corporate responsibilities to share it with members of the family and lineage and other dependents, in particular, dependents such as the Buddhist monks and nuns. The money, of course, had no intrinsic value for the renouncers like the Buddha and his monks in their quest for *nibbāna*.

Conclusions

WE find a North Indian society in the Pali texts with growing specialization of skills and artisanship. The trade has expanded, as also the use of money as a means of exchange and for acquisition. The disparity of wealth within the social groups is quite evident. The prosperous heads of households are called *gahapati*. Wealthier segment of this class are known as *seṭṭhi gahapati*, with huge cash resources available at their disposal. There appears to be an intense competition between the Buddhist and other *paribbājakas* for the patronage of the *gahapati*. The *gahapati* is the coveted prize. The Buddha is fully aware of the needs of the *gahapatis* and other lay followers including the powerful members of the ruling aristocracy of the day. The Buddha wants his lay disciples to acquire money legitimately and to spend it in a socially responsible manner. His discourses provide ideological justification for such activities in society.

Two social groups are repeatedly mentioned, the brāhmaṇas and the *khattiyas*, more specifically the Licchavis, Mallas and Sākyans. The brāhamaṇas were ritually superior to the members of the ruling extended kin-groups or *khattiyas*, but were politically subservient to them. Whereas the term *gahapati* seems never to have been applied to the *khattiyas*, the brāhmaṇas, on the other hand, seem to have allowed themselves to be referred to by this affiliation. There is evidence of rivalry between the *khattiyas* and brāhmaṇas.

The bulk of the population was landowning and land-farming peasants, but the typical *vaiśya* of the Hindu texts was not yet sharply differentiated from the poorer groups of peasants and artisans. The poorer groups were perhaps lumped together in the conceptual framework of the *suddas*. Though there was considerable division of labour and much active trade, trade differentiation also does not seem to have crystalized into a rigid caste system as yet. People might often change their occupations. The two

fundamental characteristics of modern caste system, endogamy and commensality, are absent. However, the notion of status and rank, which is the hall-mark of caste society of the later periods, is fully present in society at the time of the Buddha.

Our analysis of various modes of address, reference, and salutation found in the meetings of various persons, has shown us the orderly manner in which the people determined status and rank in society. We have identified the ranked social, political and religious relationships between individuals and between groups. However, the Buddhist textual bias is evident in making the Buddha the apex of religious hierarchy.

The examination of the world of the gods has revealed the ranked aspect of the cosmology existing in the Buddha's days. The interactions of the gods among themselves, and between them and the humans (Buddha, monks and other humans), show an entrenched notion of hierarchy. The Buddha, a human being, is head and shoulder above all the gods. The supreme god Mahābrahmā acknowledges the Buddha as his superior. Although the gods and their world are ranked as high and low, the Buddhist writers perceive the world of the gods as analogous to their classless and undifferentiated *saṅgha*. The gods are somewhat a reflection of human society. The humans' good, and ethically correct, conduct in their present life assures them a place in the world of the gods in their next. The gods are happier than the humans, and are free from discords and conflicts.

Kinship is a vital element of Indian caste society. Our study shows that there is great deal of emphasis on the role of kinship. But the society is not tribal. At a stage when increasing differentiation of social functions was taking place on the basis of kin groups, it was quite natural for people to stress rather the kinship aspect to the functional one. This perhaps explains the puzzling terminology of our texts involving the use of *ñāti* and *gahapati* with conditions very different from those of their Sanskrit equivalents in orthodox Hindu sources. We find alternative use of the word *ñāti* and *jāti* for an extended kin-group, just as we find the synonymous use of the word *jñāti* and *jāti* in

modern times, for instance, amongst the people of Mahārāṣtra where both terms denote sub-caste.

Some of these kinship terms such as *ñāti* and *ñātaka* are found in the inscriptions of Asoka.[1] Asoka often pointedly refers to these, but never seems to use the more orthodox conceptual terms like *vaṇṇa* and *jāti*, which denote social groupings. It seems that Asoka wrote his edicts to show his prowess as a mighty and benevolent king. At the same time his edicts were meant for people of all ranks of his empire. He was admonishing them in the language they understood. Asoka believed that kinship ties were key sources of power of the people, and that to foster them was in their best interests. Also in pre-Asokan society at the time of the Buddha, *vaṇṇa* and *jāti* were the concepts of the theorists. The actual state of society was one in which class and blood relationships functioned as a more important social bond.

Notes

Abbreviations

A Aṅguttara Nikāya
D Dīgha Nikāya
M Majjhima Nikāya
S Saṃyutta Nikāya
Vn Vinaya.

Notes to Chapter I

1. J. Pryzyluski, *Le Councile de Rājagrha*, 1926.
2. E.W. Adikaram, *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, 73-79. He explains the details as to how the texts came to be written- their political and religious background.
3. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, II. p. xiii; Maurice Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, pp. 16, 606-9; B.M. Barua, *Asoka and His Inscriptions*, 31 ff.
4. G.C. Pande, *Origins of Buddhism*, 15.
5. A.K. Warder, *Pali Metre*, 4-5.
6. Rhys Davids, *Cambridge History of India*, I, 192-97; See also B.C. Law, *History of Pali Literature.* II, 15, 30-33, 42. He differs from the textual stratification suggested by Rhys Davids but accepts the pre-Moriyan dating of the *Nikāyas* and the *Vinaya*.
7. Etinenne Lamotte, "Problems Concernant Lex Texts Canoniquies, Mineurs", *Journal Asiatique* (1956), 249-63.
8. G.C. Pande, *Op.Cit.*, 13.
9. Ibid., 2.
10. See Winternitz, *Op.Cit.*, 33; B.C. Law, *Op.Cit.*, 13-14.
11. Winternitz, *Op.Cit.*, 25.
12. N.A. Jayawickrame, *Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta* (Unpublished London University, Ph.D. Thesis, 1947), 10.
13. See G.C. Pande, *Op. Cit.*, 16.

14. Winternitz, *Op.Cit.*, 115 ff; See Gokuldas Day, "Significance of the *Jātakas*", *Calcutta Review* (July 1930), 83-84; R.N. Mehta (*Pre Buddhist India* , xxi ff.) has assigned a pre-Buddhist dating to some of the poems and prose narratives; but D.D. Kosambi ("Early Stages of the Caste System in Northern India,"*Journal of Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1946), 33) suggests that the *Jātakas* represent a state of society which provided suitable conditions for trade during the Sātavāhana period (2nd century A.D.) and that they do not represent the social structure of Magadha at the time of the Buddha. The view that the *Jātakas* belong to the Sātavāhana period has been criticised by R.S. Sharma (*Śudras in Ancient India*, 85) on the ground that regulations regarding trade in Kauṭilya presupposes an extensive economy. Sharma following I. Fiser ("The Problem of *Seṭṭhi* in the *Jātakas*", *Archiv Orientalani* (1954), 238 ff.) believes that "the stories of the present", are the younger element of the *Jātakas*, (late in chronology) and they occur in the cities of Eastern India, Sāvatthi and Rājagaha, whereas "the stories of the past" form the older *Jātakas* (early in chronology), the scenes of which lie in the central or western part of India. Sharma considers these "stories of the past" as belonging to the pre-Asokan period. We may note that in the *Nikāyas* and *Vinaya*, we have rarely a mention of the western or central parts of India. Banaras, although important because of its connections with the Buddha's enlightenment, is occasionally mentioned. The same is the case with Gāndhāra, Taxila and Avanti, which are considered as distant lands. Jennings (*Vedantic Buddhism of the Buddha*, xxxiii) refers to this fact while describing the Buddha's journey; see also Winternitz, *Op.Cit.*, 119-20.
15. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India* , 208.
16. Witernitz, *Op. Cit.*, 122.
17. Ibid., 119-24.
18. Cf. Rhys Davids, *Cambridge History of India*, vol. I, 172-74.
19. *Arachaeological Survey of India*, Annual Report, 1905-06, 86-102; New Imperial Series, vol. L. I, 1931, 112-31.
20. *Indian Arachaeology*, A review, 1953-54, 9; 1954-55, 16; and 1957-58, 11.

21. G.R. Sharma, *The Excavations at Kauśāmbi* (1957-59), 26, 37 ff.
22. George Erdosy, "Archaeology of Early Buddhism", in *Essays on Buddhism in Honour of Professor A.K. Warder*, edited by N.K. Wagle and F. Watanabe, 40-56. For a detailed examination of the archaeological field data during this period, see also George Erdosy, *Urbanisation in Early Historic India*, 106-30.
23. H. Bechert, "The Date of the Buddha Reconsidered," *Indologica Turinensia*, 2 (1978), 29-36.
24. Recent scholarship on the subject with sociological insights include: R.S. Sharma, *Material Culture and Social Formations in Ancient India* , 89-133; Romila Thapar, *Ancient Indian Social History*, 40-90; Uma Chakaravarti, *Social Origins of Buddhism.* See also chapters III-VI of this book.
25. Romila Thapar, *From Lineage to State*, 70-115.
26. Ibid.; for a thorough study of the republican states in this period, see J.P. Sharma, *Republics in Ancient India* , 85 ff.
27. Radcliffe Brown, *Structure and Function in Primitive Societies* .
28. Raymond Firth (ed.), *Man and Culture*, 157-87.
29. Talcott Parsons, *Essays in Sociological Theory*, 34, quoted by S.F. Nadel, *Theory of Social Structure*, 12.
30. Raymond Firth, *Elements of Social Organization*, 34.
31. S.F. Nadel, *Foundations of Social Anthropology*, 78 ff.
32. J.P. Murdock, "British Social Anthropology", *American Anthropologist*, vol. 53, 1951, 465-73.

Notes to Chapter II

1. Robert Redfield, *Peasant Society and Culture*, 11.
2. Jennings, *Vedantic Buddhism of the Buddha*, xxxii.
3. Vn. III. 46 cf. *Dhammapada*, I. 313, where a *gāma* of eight *kuṭis* is mentioned, *aṭṭhakuṭiko gāmo.*
4. I.B. Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, III. 74; *Pāli English Dictionary*, *kuṭi*, s.v.

5. The size of the *kuṭi* cannot be determined from the available references. In the forest hermitage of the *Jaṭilas* we find separate rooms for performing fire worship. See, Vn. I. 24 ff.
6. A. III. 100-02; IV. 21-22; V. 60; Vn. I. 92.
7. S. I. 61; III. 116; IV. 380.
8. D. II. 339-40.
9. Ibid., III. 94, *te araññāyatane paṇṇa kuṭiyo karitvā paṇṇa kuṭisu jhāyanti...gāme nigama rājadhāniyo osaranti ghāsaṃ esanā.*
10. Vn. III. 41, *tiṇa kuṭiyo karitvā* (*kuṭis* of grass).
11. Ibid., 46, *samanusso pi gāmo amanusso pi gāmo* (note that this is the definition of the *gāma*).
12. *Book of the Discipline*, I, 147.
13. Ibid., note 2.
14. D. III. 203.
15. Ibid., I. 116.
16. Vn. I. 149.
17. S.V.173.
18. Vn. I. 149.
19. M. II. 97, 100.
20. Vn. III. 46.
21. Ibid., I. 121.
22. Ibid., II. 46.
23. *Book of the Discipline*, I. 74.
24. See the translation of the *Vinaya* text (Sacred Books of the East, II. 121, n. 1) where *gonisādika* is rendered as an ox-stall to be used as provision room for the monks; cf. *gosālā*, cow stable, A. I. 188; also *gogaṇa*, herd of cattle, M. I. 220; A. I. 229.
25. *Gonisādinivittho, go+ nisādi+ nivittho. go* which is used in plural sense means cattle. *Nisidi*, *ni+ sad*= lying down, encamped, well arrayed. *Nivitṭha*, which is an adjective past participle of *nivesa*, used in the locative case, would mean, bent upon, devoted to.
26. Vn. I. 52, *vajo uṭṭhāsi.*

27. M. II. 185-86, for Dhāñanjāni brāhmaṇa. *Gorakkha*, the cattle keeping is usually combined with *kasi* (agriculture) and in the *Vinaya*, it is given as a superior profession, Vn. IV. 6.
28. *Sutta Nipāta*, verses, 24-25.
29. Vn. I. 152, 243; M. I. 79; S. IV. 181.

30. A. III. 373; M. I. 85.
31. Vn. III. 46, *sattho atirekacatumāsanivitṭho gāmo.*
32. Ibid., I. 73; M. I. 276; see Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, 98.
33. D. II. 344.
34. Vn. IV. 63, *sattha gamaniyo maggo.*
35. Ibid., I. 152.
36. D. II. 338 f.
37. Ibid., 344.
38. *Bṛhatkalpa Bhāsya*, I. 30 ff. (quoted in J.C. Jain, *Life in the Jain Canonical Literature*, 117).
39. Vn.III.46.

40. Ibid., I. 207; III. 247-49.
41. Ibid., III. 249, *pāṭiyekkho gāmo nivisi.*
42. Ibid., *ārāmikagāmako ti pi naṃ āhaṃsu pilindag-āmako ti pi nāmaṃ āhaṃsu.*
43. Ibid., III. 250, a park attendent's wife and daughter are mentioned.
44. M. II. 205.
45. Vn. I. 350; A. II. 182.
46. S. IV. 306-308.
47. Ibid., IV. 310.
48. Vn. III. 11 ff.
49. Ibid., *Sudinno nāma Kaladakaputto seṭṭhiputto hoti.*

50. cf. Vn. III. 200 where a *gāma* belonging to one *kula* (household) is mentioned.
51. M. II. 208-9.
52. *Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā* (III, 250) mentions Toḍey-yagāma, *gāma* between Sāvatthi and Banaras.
53. S. I. 172.
54. D. I. 127.
55. S. I. 113-14.

56. D. I. 87.
57. S. V. 352.
58. M. II. 164.
59. Ibid., III. 290.

60. A. I. 180.
61. M. I. 400.
62. D. I. 235.
63. Ibid., 170; M. II. 164.
64. Ibid., 111, 87 and 224 respectively.
65. These *gāmas* are not mentioned as *brāhmaṇa gāmas*
66. *Op.cit.*
67. The two terms, *brāhmaṇa and gahapati*, have been used as a compound. Depending on the context, these may refer to two distinct entities or groups or to one single group. This ambiguity is due to the fact that the brāhmaṇas were also *gahapati*–the well-to-do people, the heads of households –and yet different from the latter because of their birth in brāhmaṇa families. In the brāhmaṇa *gāmas*, the term *brāhamaṇa-gahapati* refers to the brāhmaṇa householders. They address the Buddha as *bho Gotama*.
68. See, for instance, Vn. I. 36-37; M. II. 141-42, 55; D. I. 111-12.
69. M. II. 164-65 and D. I. 128-29.

70. D. I. 235; M. II. 462 (Nālanda Edition).
71. S. I. 113-14.
72. M. II. 462 ff.(Nālanda Edition).
73. S. I. 172.
74. D. I. 104-5.
75. M. III. 290; A. I. 180.
76. *Op.cit.*
77. M. I. 124, 235, 366; III. 130.
78. A. III. 395.
79. S. I. 123, 126.

80. A. IV. 163, *gāmassa vā nigamassa vā avidure mahādhañ-ñarāsi.*
81. S. II. 271.
82. D. I. 102.
83. M. II. 253-54.

84. Ibid., *tassa gāmassa vā nigamassa vā khemattaṃ vā subbhikkhataṃ co appā bhādhataṃ ca saṃseyya.*
85. Ibid.
86. S. IV. 309 ff.
87. M. II. 45.
88. Ibid., III. 5.
89. I.B. Horner, *Middle Length Sayings*, II,30; III, 39; in the *Book of the Discipline*, II, 63, n. 2, she argues that word *nigama* comes from *nadigāma*, which she renders as market town or little town. She feels that originally commodities were sent by water rather than by land and hence villages on rivers became the centres of trade. However, Pāṭaligāma, which was situated near the river Soṇa is not called a *nigama*. The *nigamas*, metnioned in the texts, are not specifically said to have been near rivers. We are also not sure whether commodities were originally sent by water. We have frequent mention of land routes in our texts, but hardly any river routes. Thus the association of word *nadi* (river) with *gāma* to form *nigama*, which, in any case, seems etymologically very irregular, is improbable.
90. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha,* 126; E.M. Hare, *Gradual Sayings,* III, 186.
91. Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Kindred Sayings*, I, 233.
92. F. L. Woodward, *Gradual Sayings*, I, 71, 216.
93. *Pāli English Dictionary*, 190.
94. cf. Rām Gopal, *India of Vedic Sutras*, 150 ff.
95. M. I. 166-67.
96. S. IV. 308-10.
97. Ibid., I. 83-84; Vn. II. 83; IV.105, where the army *senā* is defined as consisting of elephants, horses, chariots and foot-soldiers, and is also sub-divided into sections.
98. M. II. 55, *Thullakoṭṭhike aggakulikassa putto.*
99. Ibid., 62.
100. Ibid., 45, 52.
101. Ibid., I. 501.
102. Vn. I. 248.
103. Ibid., 246.
104. S. I. 184.
105. See pages 36, 37, 41, 42 of this book.

106. A.IV. 438.
107. See pages 20, 21, 22 of this book.
108. Vn. I. 273.
109. Ibid., 269.

110. Ibid,, II. 157.
111. Ibid., I. 273, *bahupakāro negamassa ca.*
112. *Sutta Nipāta*, verses, 976, 991.
113. Vn. I. 8; M. I. 171.
114. *Pāli English Dictionary, nagara*, s.v.
115. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, I. p. 432.
116. Vn. III. 47.
117. Ibid., *bandheyyuṃ purisguttiṃ kareyyuṃ.*
118. M. II. 97.
119. D. II. 83; A. V. 194-95.

120. Ibid., *pākāra,* an encircling wall, rampart, a fence; cf. M. III. 11; S. IV. 194; A. IV. 107; Vn. II. 121; IV. 266.
121. Ibid., 83, *raññho paccantimaṃ nagaraṃ daḷuddāpaṃ daḷha pākāratoraṇaṃ eka dvāraṃ tatra assa dovāriko.*
122. A. IV. 106 ff.
123. D. II. 147.
124. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, II. 161.
125. The explanation of *kuḍḍa* at *Visuddhimagga*, 344, which is *gehabhittiyā etaṃ adhivacanaṃ*, "this is an epithet of a house wall", seems to support our contention; cf. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha,* II, 161, n. 1, where he thinks that the word *kuḍḍa* is perhaps *kudya* (mud).
126. *Peta Vatthu*, II, 9.
127. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, 37-38.
128. *Sākhā*, see Vn. I. 28; M. I. 135; A. I. 152.
129. Vn. III. 43, *devagahadāruṇi nagarapaṭisaṃkhārikāni āpad-atthāya nikkhittāni.*

130. See Chapter one.
131. D. II. 86-87, *Sunidhavassakāra Magadho mahāmatto Pāṭ-aligāma nagaraṃ māpeti Vajjinaṃ paṭibāhāya*; cf. M. III. 9, *Rājagahaṃ paṭisaṃkhārapeti raññho Pajjotassa asaṃ-khamāno*, distrusting king Pajjota, the king Ajātasattu was having Rājagaha strengthened.
132. Ibid.

133. Pāṭaligāma became known as Pāṭaliputta. The text explains this by the phrase, *pāṭaliputta puṭabhedanaṃ.*
134. D. II. 127.
135. Ibid., 147 ff.
136. Ibid.
137. D. II. 160, *dakkhiṇena dakkhiṇaṃ nagarassa haritvā bāhirena bāhiraṃ dakkhiṇato nagarassa Bhagavato sarīraṃ jhāpessāmīti.*
138. Ibid., *uttarena uttaraṃ nagarassa haritvā uttarena dvārena nagaraṃ pavesetvā majjhena nikkhamitvā purat-thimato nagarassa Mukuṭabandhanaṃ nāma Mallānaṃ ceti-yaṃ ettha Bhagavato sarīraṃ jhāpessāmāti.*
139. D. II. 147.

140. Vn. I. 268.
141. S. IV. 396.
142. D. II. 147.
143. Vn. III. 15.
144. D. II. 102-3; Cf D. II. 75, where the Buddha urges the Vajjis to regularly pay homage to the Vajji *cetiyas.*
145. Vn. I. 275.
146. Ibid., 276.
147. Ibid., 272.
148. Ibid., 185.
149. S. I. 75.

150. Ibid., 61.
151. Vn. I. 268-69.
152. Ibid.
153. Ibid., II. 154-59.
154. Ibid., 147.
155. Ibid., 75-76.
156. Ibid.
157. Ibid., III. 15.
158. Ibid., IV. 268.
159. Ibid., 227-28.

160. See pages 28, 29, 30 of this book.
161. D. I. 93; M. II. 33; cf. A. III. 90 where certain *gāma* and *nigama* are known for lotus-like beautiful girls.
162. S. V. 169-70.

163. D.I. 135; Translation after Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, I, 114.
164. Ibid. Rhys Davids translates here that the villages, towns and cities are pillaged by the decoits. But there is no such indication in the text which reads, *gāma ghātā pi nigama ghātāpi nagara ghātāpi dissanti*. Probably the people living in these units were harassed by the king and his officers.
165. D.II. 342-43.
166. M. II. 72.
167. Vn. I. 195-96.
168. Ibid., 197. Attempts have been made to identify these places mentioned as boundaries of *majjhima janapada*, but as yet no satisfactory explanation is available. It is noteworthy that the Buddha was halting at Sāvatthi when he defined these boundaries. In the Jain Canonical literature (*Bṛhatkalpasutra*, I. 50 quoted in J.C. Jain, *Social Conditions in the Jain Canonical Literature*, 250) Mahāvira, when he was at Sāketa, gave the following instructions to his desciples. "The monks or nuns may wonder towards the east as far as Aṅga-Magadha, towards the south as far as Kosāmbi, towards the east as far as Thūṇa and towards the north as far as Kuṇāla (Uttara Kosala)". It is interesting to note that Kajaṅgala was situated towards the east of Campā, the capital of Aṅga, and that Usiradhvaja mountain slopes are north of Kaṅkhala. Kaṅkhala was in the Himalyan region, so, too, Uttara Kosala. Thūṇa seems to be identical with the brāhmaṇa *gāma*, Thuṇa; see for details of the boundaries, B.C. Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, 34.
169. The term *dakkhiṇāpatha* occurs in the *Sutta Nipāta* (verses, 10-11) where it is used as descriptive of a settlement known as Assaka. Together with Avanti, Assaka is to be found in the list of sixteen great *janapadas*. B.C. Law (*Geography of Early Budhism*, 60) identifies it as the whole tract of land lying to the north of the river Godāvari and to the south of the Gangā.

170. A. V. 206.
171. D. III. 89.
172. Ibid., II. 337.

173. M. II. 149.
174. Ibid., 134-35.
175. S. III. 5-6.
176. Ibid., IV. 312.
177. See chapter IV.
178. A. I. 213.
179. Ray Choudhary, *Political History of India*, 95 ff.
180. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, 23.
181. D. II. 200-2.
182. Ibid., 200, *parito parito janapadesu*.
183. Ibid., 202.
184. Vn. I. 27.
185. Rhys Davids (*Cambride History of India*, I, 182) gives as probable boundaries of Magadha: the Gangā to the north, the Soṇa to the west, the country of Aṅga to the east, and the dense forest reaching plateau of Chota Nagpur to the South; B.C. Law (*Tribes in Ancient India*, 198) says that Magadha corresponded at the time of the Buddha to the modern district of Patna but with addition of northern half of the modern district of Gayā. In recent times the inhabitants of this region called it Maga, obviously derived from Magadha.
186. B.C. Law, *Tribes in Ancient India*, 194.
187. Vn. I. 35-36.
188. Ibid., 43.
189. D. I. 111.
190. S. I. 172.
191. B.C. Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, 6-7.
192. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, Assapura, s.v.
193. Ibid., Āpaṇa, s.v.
194. Ibid.
195. Ibid., Campā, s.v.
196. Vn. I. 240.
197. The northern frontiers of Kosala included hills of the Himalayas, the present day Nepal. Its southern boundary was the Gangā and its eastern boundary was in the eastern limit of the Sākya territory, see *Cambridge History of India*, I, 178, 190.

198. Woodward, *Kindred Sayings*, V, xviii; Mrs. Rhys Davids conjectures from this that either the Buddha "mainly resided there or that Sāvatthi was the earliest centre for the collection and preservation of the talks." The first alternative is preferred by Malalasekera (*Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, II, 1127).
199. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, 8.
200. Jennings, *Vedantic Buddhism of the Buddha*, 262, n.4.
201. M. II. 110, 127.
202. Vn. I. 276 and M. III. 7.
203. See pages 15, 16 of this book.
204. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, Daṇḍakappa, Caṇḍakappa, Pakudhā and Nāḷakapāna, s.v.
205. B.C. Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism*, 5.
206. S. III. 140.
207. A. I. 276, *Kosalesu cārikaṃ caramāno yena Kapilavatthu tad avasari*.
208. Ibid., 277, where the Buddha stays (*viharati*) over night in Kapilvatthu.
209. *Sutta Nipāta*, 15-19.
210. M. II. 18 ff.
211. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, Naṅgaraka, Meḍaḷumpa, Devadāha, Khomadussa, s.v.
212. Cf. Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Psalms of the Brethren*, 10, where she refers to the account of the Chinese chroniclers who locate the region on the mountain slopes eastward of the Sākyan region; see also Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, 26.
213. D. II. 47, 159; III. 207.
214. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, II. 454. He does not substantiate his statement with the evidence from the *Nikāyas* and *Vinaya* texts.
215. Manu, X. 22.
216. D.D. Kosambi, *Introduction to Indian History*, 147.
217. See N.K. Wagle, "Minor Rites and Rituals Attributed to the Brāhmaṇas in the Nikāya Texts of the Pāli Canon", in *Journal of the Oriental Institute*, vol.XVII, no.4, 363-373.
218. Buhler (*Laws of Manu*, Sacred Books of the East, vol. 25, Introduction, cxvii) advocates that the recension of Manu's code was made during the period 200 B.C.-200 A.D.

219. D. III. 207.

220. A. V. 70; II.79.
221. D. II. 165.
222. Rhys Davids (*Buddhist India*, 25, 26), B.C. Law (*India as Known in the Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism*, 121-22) and Malalasekera (*Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, Vol.II, 813,879) have assumed that at the Buddha's time the Videhans were a part of the Vajjis. Malalasekera disregards the statement about the *aṭṭha-kulaka*, which for some scholars implied heads of eight confederate clans. Malalasekera believes that as there is no other evidence regarding the number of clans except that of the *Dīgha Aṭṭhakathā* (591) the conjectures of the scholars is doubtful. We agree with his suggestion that aṭṭhakula were a judicial committee; cf. D. II. 160, where eight Mallan lineage elders officiate at the funeral of the Buddha.
223. M. II. 72, 133. The territory of Videha bordered on the Gangā, one the one side of which was Magadha and the other Videha. Adjacent to it were Kāsi and Kosala. It is noteworthy that at the time of the redaction of the *Brāhmaṇas* the Kosala-Vedeha occupied an important position and was situated to the east of the brāhmaṇical *madhyadeśa* (middle region). See Julius Eggling, *Śatapatha Brāhamaṇa*, Sacred Books of the East, vol 12, introduction, xlii, xliii.
224. A. IV. 16.
225. Ibid., 17.
226. Ibid., III. 75.
227. B.C. Law, *India as Known to the Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism*, 123.
228. Ibid., 124.
229. A. II. 75.

230. Hare, *Gradual Sayings*, III, 62, notes 1 and 3.
231. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, II, 841.
232. A. III. 75 f.
233. D. II. 123.
234. S. V. 431.
235. Vn. I. 231-32.

236. This may be the reason why Mahāvira was called Ñāta-putta, the son of the Ñātas, by the Buddhist writers; Cf. H. Jacobi, *Jain Sutras*, Sacred Book of the East, vol. 22, introduction, x.
237. D. II. 123.
238. Ibid., 164 ff.
239. B.C. Law, *Tribes in Ancient India*, 281.

Notes to Chapter III

1. D. I. 89, 113, 236; M. I. 165, 208-9; II. 134, 147, 394; S. IV. 118.
2. A. I. 67-70, 155, 157-58, 163-66, 169-73; II. 43-44, 172-73, 173-76,232-33; III, 227-30; IV. 41-46, 54-56, 173-79, 285-89; D.I. 89-90,106, 108, 118-26, 134, 224-27, 236-27, 236-37, 252; M. I. 198-208, 285-90, 356-59; II. 108-110, 141-42, 142-45, 147-48, 157, 165-68, 168-69, 177, 197-208, 210-11, 213, 462-63: III. 1-7: S. I. 160-61, 162-63, 163-64, 164-65, 166-67, 171, 172-73, 175, 176-77, 178-79, 179-80, 181, 182; II 77; V. 2, 17, 19, 352-56; Su.Ni. 87-91; Vn. I. 2-3. In the *Sutta Nipāta* (vs. 620), a brāhmaṇa is called *bho-vādin* (one who utters *bho*), in contrast to a good brāhamaṇa. See also *Dhammapada,* vs. 396.
3. S. I. 136.
4. Ibid., I. 179.
5. Ibid., I. 173.
6. Vn. I. 212-13, also exchange of greetings, *saddhiṃ sammodi*, (*s. s.*) takes place.
7. A. III. 239-40.
8. D. I. 89-90, *kaṁci kathaṃ sārāṇīyaṃ vitisāterti thiṭo pi nisinnena bhagavatā kaṁcikaṁci kathaṃ sārāṇīyaṃ viti sāreti.*
9. S. I. 177-78.
10. D. I. 125-26.
11. M. II. 143-44.
12. Ibid., 144, *Brāhmāyu brāhmaṇo uttāyāsanā eka masaṃ uttarāsagaṃ karitvā bhagavato pādesu sirasā nipatitvā bhagavato pādāni mukhena ca paricumbati pāṇihi ca parisambāhati nāmaṃ ca sāveti.*

13. M. II. 401-2 (Nālandā edition).
14. See M. I. 371; II.228-30, 236, 243 f.
15. M. I. 229-30.
16. Ibid., 392-94.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid., I. 497.
19. Ibid., II. 40, 41-44.
20. Ibid., II. 43, *samaṇo Gotamo pāpito bhavissati.*
21. M. I. 489, 493 ff.
22. D. I. 163 ff. Acela Kassapa is not mentioned as a *paribbājaka,* but may be included in the group because of the similar attitude of the Buddha towards the *paribbājakas* and this Acela Kassapa; cf. Vn. IV. 91, where Acela is defined as *paribbājaka sampanna*, "who has reached the stage of the wanderer".
23. M. I. 339-42.
24. A. II. 51; III.366; V. 70, 108, 151, 154, 170, 337; M. I. 12, 40, 122, 130-31, 142, 205, 256 , 14-20, 437-38; II. 104; III. 129-30, 155, 253-58 ; S. I. 150; II. 1 ff, 17, 41, 92-98, 127-28, 280, 281, 283; III. 5 ff; IV. 72; Vn. I. 74 f, 105, 350; II. 112; III. 7, 211, 230. On occcasions *bhadante,* a varient of the form *bhante* is used by the monks for the Buddha. The monks usually use this term when they are in groups.
25. M. III. 238ff.
26. Ibid., III. 246-47, *accaye me bhante, accagāma yathābālaṃ yathāmūḷhaṃ yathā akusalaṃ yohāṃ Bhagavantaṃ āvuso vādena samudācaritabbaṃ amannissaṃ tassa me, bhante, Bhagavā accaṃ accayato paṭiggaṇhatu saṃvarayati.*
27. Vn. I. 8-10.
28. Vn. I. 9, *arahaṃ bhakkhave tathāgato sammā sambuddho.*
29. See note 24 for references.

30. A. II. 51; Vn. III. 230, 211; II. 75 respectively.
31. Vn. II. 112; III. 7; S. II. 17 respectively.
32. Ibid., III. 211.
33. Ibid., II. 112.
34. M. III. 129-30.

35. A. II. 53; III.49, 391; IV. 212; D. I. 211; III. 180-81; M. I. 285-90, 359, 376; II. 24; III. 291-93; S.III. 1 ff, 48-49, 212; IV. 109, 110, 28; V. 348 ff, 352-56; Vn. I. 16, 227; II. 156. The authors of the *Pāli English Dictionary* (77) suggest a possible English rendering of the term *gahapati* in vocative singular as *sir*, and vocative plural as *sirs* (*gahapatayo*). But these English substitutions do not seem to carry with them the full force of the original Pāli sense. For that reason it would be best to retain the original Pāli form.
36. M. I. 359-60.
37. Ibid., 360, *anovādi anupavādi*.
38. A. IV. 91.
39. Vn. II. 156.

40. As in the case of brāhmaṇa youths.
41. A. V. 65-66; D. II. 50-51; M. II. 93; S. I. 64 ff; Vn. 126-29.
42. S. I. 68-69.
43. Ibid., I. 69 ff.
44. See note 41 of this chapter for references .
45. S. IV. 305, 306, 308-9, 310-11, 312 f, 323, 325 ff, 340-41 ff.
46. Ibid., IV. 340.
47. See Woodward, *Kindered Sayings*, IV, 244, n.5, who notes this change in the mode of address but feels that, as in the sentence below the *gāmaṇi* says *bhante* again, the reading should be *bho* instead of *bhante*. However, Woodward fails to notice the change in the term of reference which occured simultaneously. As is seen, *bhante Bhagavā* is replaced by *bho Gotama*. Thus a definite effort is made to distinguished the two terms.
48. A. I. 188-89, 275 ff; II. 200 ff ; III. 76, 168; IV. 281 ; V. 83, 335; D. II. 130-31, 279 ff; III. 2f, 208-9; M. I. 387; S. III. 69; IV. 182-83; V. 389, 397; Vn. I. 82.
49. D. III. 20.

50. S. IV. 182-83.
51. Vn. I. 82 cf. Vn. II. 253,255, where the Buddha addresses his mother's sister, who had married his father, as *Gotamī*.
52. A. IV. 281.
53. See note 48 for references.

54. M. I. 108.
55. A. I. 136; II. 112-13; IV. 6-7, 79f, 197-204, 216, 258-59; D. I. 126; M. I. 339ff, 36; III. 237; S. V. 345, 407; Vn. I. 224; III, 11 ff.
56. S. V. 344.
57. Vn. III. 76.
58. M. II. 98.
59. D. III. 154.
60. Vn. I. 92.
61. For *āvuso*: A. I. 118-19; II. 160; III. 202, 201, 355, 382 ff; IV.362, 402 ff, 449 f; V. 41-42, 155, 161-61; M. I. 147-151, 160-61, 210, 212, 258 ; S. I. 190; II. 115, 117, 195 f, 267-77; III. 109, 133, 335; IV. 55-56; V. 15, 76, 298; Vn. II. 25,111; III. 104, 105,167; IV. 44.
62. For *bhante*: A. IV. 385; D. I. 151; II. 158; M. I. 205; II. 244 ff; III. 184 ff; S. II. 215; IV. 284, 289 ; Vn. I. 197 f; II. 292; III. 23, 67, 300.
63. D. II. 15.
64. D. II. 162-68; Vn. II. 284 ff.
65. Otto Franke, "The Buddhist Councils of Rājagaha and Vesāli", *Journal of the Pāli Text Society*, 1908, 32 ff.
66. Vn. II. 31 f.
67. S. III. 120.
68. Ibid., 133 f.
69. Ibid., II. 276-77 f.
70. Vn. II. 25.
71. Ibid., IV.44, where these monks bully other monks and throw them out of their lodgings.
72. Ibid., II. 160 ff.
73. Ibid., III. 171 ff; he refers to the Buddha as *samaṇo Gotamo*.
74. A. I. 215; V. 121-22, 194; D. II. 162; M. I.227-28. 513 III. 124, 207; S. I. 120 ff; III. 116; IV. 401 ff; Vn. III. 240.
75. S. III. 116, *so cāvaṃ bhikkhu navo bhavissati acira pabbajito thero vā pana bālo avyottoti.*
76. M. III. 207.
77. A. V. 196-98.
78. S. IV. 391.

79. A. I. 66-68; M. II. 158, 186; III. 13, 78; S. IV. 118-19; V. 272-73.

80. D. I. 89 ff, 205-6; Vn. I. 247; III. 119.
81. D. I. 150-51.
82. M. II. 158.
83. S. IV. 122-124.
84. M. II. 66 ff; Vn. II. 291.
85. M. II. 101-2, 113; Vn. III. 248 f; A. III. 59-62, respectively.
86. M. III. 138.
87. A. I. 220 ff; II. 194-95; III. 96; D. I. 151; II. 159, 160; S. V. 327; Vn. III. 125-26.
88. A. II. 194.
89. A. I. 217-19; IV. 213; V..342, 343; M. I. 396-7; II. 62-63; III. 145 ff; S. I. 113, 283-88, 290, 291 ff, 296; V. 176-77, 381 f, 385 f; Vn. III. 16, 161.

90. A. V. 342-43.
91. Vn. II. 15-18.
92. Ibid., 18, *gahapatiṃ pasannamdāyokaṃ kārakaṃ saṃghupaṭṭāhakaṃ hīnena khinasessasi hīnena vambhessasi.*
93. A. I. 193 f ;IV. 59· Vn. I. 179-80, 194-95;II. 217; III. 42-43, 62, 104, 181, 211, 215, 265f.
94. Vn. I. 194.
95. A. I. 193.
96. Vn. III. 131-32 cf. Vn. III. 119.
97. Vn. I. 209; II. 212; III. 131-32; IV. 164, 167, 169.
98. S. IV. 325.
99. A. V. 196.

100. M. I. 378.
101. S. IV. 298 f.
102. S. IV. 300 f.
103. A. V. 189; Vn. I. 242.
104. M. II. 196-97.
105. Vn. II. 157.
106. Ibid.,158.
107. S. IV. 315.
108. M. II. 62; Vn. III. 17.
109. S. V. 344.

110. A. III. 296-97.
111. S. IV. 303.
112. Ibid.,V. 380.
113. M. I. 380.
114. Vn. II. 155.
115. D. I. 89, 113, 236; M. I. 165, 208-9; II. 134, 147, 394; S. IV. 118.
116. M. II. 134.
117. D. II. 72-73, 232, 234-35; M. II. 91-92, 127, 132; S. I. 82; Vn. III. 43.
118. S. I. 82.
119. M. II. 127.

120. Ibid., I. 91.
121. D. I. 225.
122. M. I. 502.
123. Ibid., 175.
124. D. II. 166.
125. Ibid., II. 160.
126. M. II. 99.
127. D. III. 37.
128. S. IV. 298-99.
129. Vn. II. 15-18.

130. S. IV. 325-26.
131. D. I. 47, 49; S. I. 82,86; M. II. 75; Vn. I. 273.
132. Vn. I. 240.
133. D. II. 72-73.
134. Ibid., II. 237.
135. Vn. III. 43.
136. M. II. 148.
137. See D. II. 99-100; M. I. 358; S.I.153.
138. See Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, I, 97-107.
139. Ibid., 105.

140. Ibid, 163-66.
141 D. II. 39; Vn. I. 7; A. V. 269, 273.
142. Rhys Dvids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, I, 299.
143. Ibid., 140.
144. *Sutta Nipāta*, 115 ff; D. I. 235 ff.
145. *Dialogues of the Buddha*, I, 140-42.

Notes to Chapter IV

1. M. II. 130.
2. S. III. 85.
3. Ibid.,II. 105.
4. Ibid.,III. 85.
5. A. I. 115, *devalokāpapattiyā brahmacariyaṃ ussatīti.*
6. S. I. 57-58.
7. M. III. 262; S. I. 33.
8. A. II. 49.
9. Ibid., I. 64.
10. S. III. 119-24.
11. M. I. 497.
12. A. III. 30.
13. M. I. 245.
14. D. II. 163.
15. See Ibid., II. 50-52; M. I. 245,326 f; S. I. 20, 140.
16. See A. I. 64; II. 49; III. 309.
17. Ibid., II. 269, 288.
18. A. I. 278-79.
19. S. I. 207, 213-14.
20. D. III. 194.
21. Ibid., II. 319.
22. E. W. Adikaram, *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon,* 149.
23. S. V. 185-86; A. II. 21; M. I. 168-69.
24. A. IV. 173.
25. S. I. 421-23.
26. M. I. 485.
27. S. I.1 58; D. II. 157.
28. Ibid., I. 150-51.
29. Ibid., I. 153-54.
30. D. III. 97-98; S. I. 153.
31. S. I. 144-45.
32. M. I. 326. ff; cf. S. I. 142.
33. Vn. III. 18-19.
34. S. I. 198.
35. Ibid., I. 61.

36. Ibid., I. 204.
37. Ibid., I. 8-9.
38. Ibid., I. 200.
39. D. II. 356.

40. S. I. 144-45.
41. A. III. 122-23.
42. S. IV. 269ff.
43. D. I. 215-23.
44. Ibid., I. 25.
45. A. III. 332.
46. S. V. 232-33.
47. Ibid., V. 349.
48. Ibid., I. 34-35.
49. A. I. 215.

50. Ibid., III. 78.
51. S. I. 92.
52. Ibid., I. 57-58.
53. A. III. 32-33.
54. D. III. 356.
55. M. III. 262.
56. S. V. 409-10.
57. D. II. 217.
58. S. III. 251.
59. M. II. 75.

60. S. IV. 308-9.
61. D. II. 206 ff. Ajita, the general of the Licchavis, is born in the realm of the *Tāvatiṃsa* gods (*Tāvatiṃsa kāyakaṃ upapanno*), D. III. 15.
62. M. II. 131-32.
63. A. IV. 63-66.
64. S. IV. 302-4.
65. D. III. 88.
66. Ibid.,II. 250.
68. Ibid., II. 238-40.
69. Ibid., II. 327.

70. Ibid., I. 237.
71. A. III. 224-25.

72. M. I'. 194-95.
73. A. III. 363.
74. S. I. 140-41.
75. D. II. 250.
76. Ibid., III. 28-30 ff.; cf. M. I. 327.
77. A. V. 59-60.
78. Ibid., I. 213.
79. D. I. 250-1.
80. Ibid., I. 215-23.
81. S. V. 409-10.
82. D. I. 252.
83. Ibid., II. 241.
84. S. V. 410.
85. A. IV. 188-90.
86. M. I. 210.
87. A. I. 227.
88. S. II. 121.
89. Ibid., II. 211, 226-27.
90. Ibid., II. 227-28.
91. Ibid., II. 288.
92. *Dialogues of the Buddha*, I, 280.
93. Ibid., I. 5.
94. S. I. 231-32.
95. Ibid., I. 237-38.
96. A. IV. 142-43.
97. A. IV. 162-64.
98. D. II. 207-9.
99. See, S. I. 221; D. II. 87, 207-9.
100. M. I. 255.
101. S. I. 218-19.
102. Ibid., IV. 201.
103. Ibid., I. 225.
104. Ibid., I. 224.
105. Ibid., I. 216; see also Susīma *devaputta*'s use of *bhadanta* for Sakka, S. I. 217.
106. Ibid., I. 146-47.
107. Ibid., I. 145.
108. Ibid., V. 282.

109. D. I. 247.

110. Cf. Ibid., I. 247. ff.
111. Ibid., I. 91.
112. *Dialogues of the Buddha*, II, 296.
113. S. I. 78-79.
114. See, for example, A. I. 118-19; II. 160; III. 202; M. I. 147-51, 160-61; S. I. 90.
115. See A. I. 215; D. II. 162; M. I. 227-28.
116. See Ibid., A. IV. 385; D. I. 151; II. 158; M. I. 205; S. II. 215.
117. See Chapter III for details.
118. See, D. I. 89, 113, 236; M. I. 165; II. 134, 147; S. IV. 118.
119. For the Buddha, see, Ibid., D. I. 108, 118,134; M. II. 165; A. IV. 41; S. V. 217; for the monks, see, M. II. 158, 186; III. 78; S. V. 272; IV. 118; A. I. 67; D. I. 89.

120. See, for example, M. I. 175, 502.
121. S. V. 176, 380.
122. D. II. 133.
123. S. IV. 348.
124. Ibid., V. 390.

Notes to Chapter V

1. A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and Daryll Forde, *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage* (London, 1960), Introduction, 3.
2. Ibid., 10-11.
3. Ibid.
4. A. I. 62, *mātā-pitaro puttānaṃ āpādakā posakā imassa dassetarotī.*
5. Ibid., II. 70.
6. D. III. 189.
7. M. II. 185-86.
8. Ibid., 50 ff.
9. S. I. 181.

10. Vn. III. 10, 16 and 18.
11. Ibid., I. 272.
12. Ibid., 85-86.
13. S. I. 177.

14. Vn. IV. 223-24.
15. S. I. 177.
16. Vn. I. 82.
17. D. III. 189.
18. Ibid.
19. D. II. 340.

20. Vn. I. 15; II. 180; A. I. 145.
21. Ibid., I. 179.
22. Vn. I. 77.
23. M. II. 106.
24. Ibid., II. 56-57.
25. Ibid., 60.
26. Ibid., III. 13-14.
27. Ibid., I. 17.
28. A. I. 179.
29. M. II. 166; D. I. 115.

30. V. I. 82-83.
31. S. I. 176-77.
32. Ibid., III. 18.
33. Vn. I. 43.
34. D. I. 85.
35. Vn. III. 18.
36. M. II. 63; Vn. III. 16; *Majjima* account has this: *mattikaṃ dhānaṃ aḍḍaṃ pettikaṃaḍḍaṃ pitāmahaṃ*; where as in the *Vinaya* we have an addition of the words, *mātu* before *mattikaṃ*, and additional *itthīkāya itthīdhānaṃ*. Thus mother's wealth is specified as woman's wealth.
37. Vn. I. 82-83.
38. S. I. 89-90.
39. Ibid., I. 92.

40. D. II. 331.
41. S. I. 86.
42. M. I. 360.
43. Vn. III. 66.
44. Ibid., III. 66-67.

45. D. III. 189; *petānaṃ kālakatānaṃ dakkhiṇaṃ, anupād-assati.*
46. A. II. 67-68.
47. Vn. IV. 334-35.
48. A. V. 264.
49. Ibid., IV. 265.

50. S. I. 171.
51. Vn. IV. 79.
52. Ibid., III. 144.
53. Ibid., III. 135.
54. D. II. 331.
55. S. I. 86.
56. Vn. III. 128.
57. S. I. 177.
58. Vn. II. 180-1; Here taking Mahānāma as an elder brother we have relied on the fact that his name invariably precedes that of Anuruddha.
59. See page 113 of this book.

60. M. II. 123; A. III. 348.
61. Vn. II. 139; *chanda* has been taken to mean Sanskrit language by *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, *chanda*, s.v.
62. D. II. 131, *dve kassaka bhātarā.*
63. Vn. I. 33-34.
64. D. II. 331.
65. Vn. IV. 223.
66. Ibid., I. 82.
67. Ibid., II. 182, *yāvāhaṃ putte ca bhātare ca rajjaṃ niyyā-demīti.*
68. S. I. 92, *bhātuca pana eka puttavaṃ sāpateyyassā kāraṇā jīvitā voropesi.*
69. A. V. 93.

70. *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, Suddhodana, s.v.
71. A. IV. 276, *bahupakārā mahāpajāpati Gotami Bhagavato mātuccha āpādiko posikā.*
72. M. II. 64; V. III. 17; see also Vn. IV. 263.
73. Vn. II. 205.
74. A. IV. 210.

75. An "avoidance" relationship calls for a minimisation of actual contacts. It is opposed to "normal" relationship in that individual temperaments of the persons do not play a great role. The sexual relationship between persons is prohibited but where it occurs, there is no incest. In fact, it is to avoid the sexual relationship that "avoidance" is practised. An example of avoidance relationship in modern Indian society is that between a daughter-in-law and a father-in-law.
76. Vn. IV. 332-33, where a senior nun addresses a probationer as *ayye*. See also Vn. IV. 326.
77. Ibid., IV. 318, 211.
78. The exception is, however, made in the case of Mahāpajāpati Gotami who is addressed by the monk Ānanda as *Gotami*. It may be remembered that it was she who was responsible for admission of women into the Buddha's *saṃgha*. See Vn. IV. 254.
79. A. III. 69, *sallape asihatthena*.
80. Ibid., IV. 93.
81. D. II. 239, 244.
82. M. II. 64.
83. A. IV. 210.
84. Ibid., III. 295-98.
85. Vn. I. 240-41.
86. Ibid., I. 216-17.
87. Vn. III. 17.
88. A. II. 57 ff.
89. Vn. I. 272.
90. S. I. 170.
91. M. I. 450-451.
92. Vn. IV. 78-79.
93. A. IV. 210.
94. D. II. 245.
95. A. III. 296; II. 61.
96. M. II. 110.
97. A. III. 296.
99. Vn. I. 83.
100. Ibid., III. 17.

101. M. II. 64.
102. A. IV. 210.
103. D. II. 331.
104. A. III. 58.
105. Ibid., III. 57.
106. Ibid., II. 61.
107. Ibid., III. 296.
108. M. II. 110.
109. Ibid., II. 64.

110. Vn. III. 17-18.
111. D. II .246.
112. Vn. I. 272.
113. Ibid., I. 276.
114. Ibid., IV. 263.
115. S. I. 170.
116. M. I. 384-85.
117. Vn. III. 83.
118. Ibid.; IV. 225.
119. D. III. 190.

120. A. II. 36-38.
121. Ibid., III. 92-93.
122. D. I. 123.
123. Ibid., I. 123, *ahaṃ assa mātāpitaro jānāmi ... ahaṃ assa mante vācetā.*
124. Vn. III. 66-67.
125. Ibid., III. 66.
126. S. I. 85, *rājā Ajātasattu Vedehiputto adubbhantassa dubbhati atha ca pana me bhāgineyyo hoti.*
127. Vn. IV. 105.
128. D. III. 72.
129. A. II. 78.

130. Vn. III. 120.
131. Ibid.
132. Ibid., 136-37.
133. Ibid., 137.
134. Ibid., I. 240-41.
135. Ibid., I. 273.
136. A. III. 37.

137. S. I. 86.
138. Vn. III. 13-19.
139. Ibid., IV. 20-21.

140. Ibid. It is significant to note that the mother-in-law addresses in a suspicious mood the daughter-in-law as *je*, a term of address which is elsewhere used for slaves.
141. A. II. 78.
142. Ibid., IV. 92-93.
143. S. I. 176.
144. Vn. II. 254.
145. S. II. 281.
146. Ibid., II. 281.
147. A. III. 347.
148. S. I. 97.
149. A. IV. 276.

150. D. III. 72.
151. Vn. III. 16.
152. S. I. 97.
153. Vn. III. 135.
154. Ibid., *amhe na jānāti ke vā ime kassavāti kismiṃ viya kumārikāya vatthuṃ.*
155. Ibid., III. 135.
156. See page 113 of this book.
157. D. I. 99.
158. Vn. II. 154-55.
159. Ibid., III. 139-40.

160. Ibid., III. 135-36.
161. Ibid., III. 136, *atha kho sā gaṇaki tesaṃ ājīvaka sāvakānaṃ dhītaraṃ adāsi.*
162. Ibid., IV. 18.
163. Ibid., III. 135.
164. A. I. 137; IV. 210; Vn. I.23; II. 25; S. II. 243.
165. A. IV. 210.
166. Ibid., *taṃ purisaṃ pakkosāpetvā vāmen hatthen pajāpatiṃ gahetva dakkhiṇena hattena bhiṅgāraṃ gahetvā tassa purissassa oṇojesiṃ.*
167. See, M. I. 236; Vn. I. 39.
168. A. III. 223-30.

169. M. II. 149.

170. *Majjhima Aṭṭhakathā* , III. 409.
171. Vn. II. 139.
172. M. I. 185.
173. Ibid., II. 153.
174. D. I. 97.
175. Festive occasions of the brāhmaṇas.
176. D. I. 92.
177. A. IV. 18-19.
178. Ibid., V. 19, *vajjī yā tā kulitthiyo kulakumāriyo tā na okkassa pasayha vāsessanti.*
179. Vn. III. 225.

180. Ibid., III. 66-67.
181. It is interesting to note that a numbr of Himālayan tribes in Assam and Nepal practice, "matrilateral cross-cousin" marriage today.
182. *Aṅguttara Aṭṭhakathā*, I. 158 ff.
183. D. I. 92, 97.
184. D. I. 71.
185. A. I. 115.
186. Vn. III. 224, 244; IV. 107.
187. M. II. 186.
188. A. V. 244.
189. Ibid., III. 76 f.

190. D. II. 26.
191. Vn. I. 147-48.
192. A. IV. 244; see Ibid., 245 where in the verse it is said, *raṭṭho hito devahito ñātīnaṃ sakhinaṃ hito.*
193. M. II. 186.
194. Ibid.
195. Vn. I. 272.
196. Ibid., I. 240.
197. A. IV. 396.
198. Ibid., IV. 152.
199. D. I. 116, 133.

200. Ibid., II. 148.
201. M. II. 397 (Nālanda Edition).

202. D. II. 345-46.
203. Vn. II. 126.
204. S. IV. 302-3.
205. M. I. 506.
206. A. I. 222.
207. S. IV. 190; V. 300-1.
208. Ibid., IV. 59.
209. Vn. III. 66-67, *kuṭumbañca santhā pesi dānañca paṭṭhāpesi.*
210. Ibid., *sabbassa kuṭumbassa issarā bhavissati.*
211. A. III. 295.
212. Ibid., 96.
213. S. II. 200; Vn. III. 83, 284-49.
214. Vn. IV. 20, *kulūpako hoti bahukulāni upāsaṃ kāmāti.*
215. D. I. 91.
216. Vn. I. 240-41.
217. D. III. 189 f.
218. For Lohicca brāhmaṇa, see D. I. 110.
219. S. IV. 121.
220. Vn. III. 249-50.
221. A. V. 393.
222. S. IV. 239.
223. Vn. I. 43.
224. A. IV. 282-87.
225. Ibid.
226. Vn. III. 211.
227. A. II. 123.
228. D. I. 89.
229. A. IV. 282.
230. Ibid., V. 89.
231. Ibid., IV. 355 f.
232. Ibid., I. 152.
233. A. IV. 244.
235. Ibid., III. 76, 300.
236. Vn. III. 200.
237. A. II. 249, *kulāni bhogesu mahantāni pattāni cirraṭṭhakāni bhavanti.*
238. D. II. 147.

239. Vn. IV. 67.

240. A. IV. 212.
241. D. II. 249.
242. Vn. IV. 227.
243. Ibid., IV. 81.
244. M. II. 186 f.
245. S. V. 365.
246. M. II. 397 (Nālanda Edition).
247. A. IV. 259.
248. D. II. 345.
249. Vn. I. 4, *ñātisālohita devatā.*

250. D. II. 26-27.
251. M. I. 510.
252. S. IV. 302-3.
253. Vn. II. 126.
254. S. IV. 190.
255. Vn. I. 345.
256. A. V. 269.
257. Vn. III. 206, 212, 214, 216, 219, 235; IV. 60-61.
258. S. IV. 239.
259. Vn. III. 207.

260. A. III. 96.
261. Vn. I. 147-48.
262. Ibid., III. 198.
263. Ibid., I. 147-48.
264. Ibid., IV. 190.
265. Ibid., III. 211.
266. Ibid., III. 15.
267. Ibid., III. 207, 258.
268. Ibid., III. 211.
269. Ibid., III. 216.

270. Ibid., III. 234.
271. Ibid., III. 235.
272. Ibid., III. 209.
273. Ibid., IV. 60.
274. Ibid., IV. 61.
275. Vn. IV. 268 f.

276. M. II. 67-68.
277. Vn. IV. 20.
278. See page 147 of this book.
279. Vn.,II. 154 ff.

280. Ibid., III. 138.
281 D. III. 72.
282. S. IV. 121.
283. A. II. 112.
284. Vn. I. 86.
285. A. III. 35.
286. Ibid., II. 249.
287. Vn. III. 184; IV. 80, 177, 272.
288. A. II. 85.
289. M. II. 183.

290. Ibid.,II. 178.
291. D. III. 81.
292. Vn. IV. 274.
293. A. V. 234.
294. D. I. 95.
295. Ibid., I. 87.
296. See Ibid., I. 88, 224; M. II. 134, 164.
297. D. I. 115.
298. M. II. 37-38.
299. Ibid.,III. 177; cf. A. I. 107.

300. S. I. 166, *mā jātiṃ pucca caraṇañca puccha kaṭṭhā have jāyeti jātavedo nīcākulino pi munī dhitīmā.*
301: M. III. 205.
302. D. I. 123.
303. Ibid., I. 95.
304. Ibid., I. 113, 131.
305. Vn. III. 169.
306. Ibid., IV. 6.
307. A. I. 162.
308. Ibid., III. 383-84.
309. D. I. 99.

310. S. I. 99-100.
311. Vn. IV. 6.

312. D. I. 99, 123.
313. Ibid., I. 90-92.
314. S. I. 168.
315. D. I. 123.
316. Ibid., I. 113, 130; M. II. 165 respectively.
317. S. IV. 122.
318. M. II. 102.
319. D. I. 193.

320. M. I. 429.
321. D. III. 111; A. I. 164.
322. Ibid., I. 92.
323. S. I. 170.
324. A. II. 238.
325. M. II. 127.
326. D. II. 51.
327. M. II. 210-11.
328. Vn. I. 82.
329. D. I. 99.

330. A. IV. 198 f.
331. Ibid., IV. 373; V. 23.
332. Vn. IV. 7.
333. See page 73 of this book.
334. Vn. IV. 6.
335. Ibid., IV. 7.
336. M. II. 97, 100.
337. Ibid., II. 165.
338. D. I. 82.
339. Ibid., I. 193.

340. M. II. 429.
341. S. IV. 218.
342. M. II. 128-29.
343. Ibid.
344. Ibid.
345. Ibid., II. 147.
346. A. III. 242.
347. Ibid., IV. 210.
348. S. I. 166.
349. A. IV. 239.

350. S. III. 8.
351. Ibid., I. 74.
352. A. II. 205.
353. Ibid., III. 363.
354. D. II. 85, 109.
355. Vn. I. 71, *bhikkhave imāhaṃ ... ñātinaṃ āveṇiyaṃ parihāraṃ dassamiti.*
356. D. II. 165.
357. Vn. I. 247.
358. M. II. 67.
359. A. V. 264, *ñātakā anupubbena parikkhayaṃ gacchanti.*

360. D. I. 115.
361. Ibid., I. 62.
362. M. III. 46.
362. Ibid., III. 46; Vn. III. 139.
363. D. III. 165.
364. A. III. 147.
365. S. IV. 246.
366. A. II. 45.
367. Vn. III. 164.
368. Ibid., I. 147-48, *ñātighare ñātakehi saṃparikinno hoti.*
369. Ibid., III. 15.

370. A. IV. 210.
371. D. II. 249.
372. Vn. IV. 227.
373. Ibid., IV. 81.
374. Ibid., IV. 227-28.
375. *Sāratthappakāsini*, III, 286.

Notes to Chapter VI

1. I.B.Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, II, 176.
2. *Sutta Nipāta*, 613, verse.
3. Vn. IV. 6-7.
4. Ibid., I. 369.
5. S. V. 169.
6. Vn. IV. 6-7.
7. A. III. 225.
8. S. III. 131.

9. Ibid., II. 101-2.

10. Ibid.
11. Vn. I. 249.
12. D. I .225.
13. Vn. II. 182-83.
14. Ibid., IV. 7.
15. Ibid., 308.
16. D. I. 225 and M. II. 75-76.
17. Vn. I. 344.
18. M. II. 75-76.
19. Vn. IV. 7.

20. Ibid., III. 259.
21. Ibid., II. 159.
22. S. V. 149.
23. D. I. 74.
24. Vn. IV. 6 f.
25. Ibid.
26. M. II. 206.
27. Vn. III. 72.
28. M. II. 51.
29. D. I. 51.

30. Vn. IV. 7.
31. Ibid., III. 244-45.
32. Ibid., 41-42.
33. M. II. 48-53.
34. D. I. 104.
35. See Mcdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, Āṅgirasa, s.v.
36. A. III. 239-40.
37. M. III. 237-38.
38. Vn. I. 344.
39. Ibid., I. 42

40. M. I. 31-32.
41. S. II. 215.
42. Vn. III. 106.
43. A. IV. 120.
44. D. II. 135-36.
45. M. I. 25.

46. A. IV. 127.
47. Vn. IV. 167.
48. D. I. 78.
49. Ibid., I. 51.

50. Vn. IV. 6.
51. Ibid., III. 224-25.
52. Ibid., I. 269.
53. Ibid., IV. 308.
54. A. I. 26.
55. See Vn. I. 270 ff.
56. A. II. 451.
57. Vn. I. 72.
58. Ibid., I. 273.
59. D. I. 48-49.

60. Vn. I. 270.
61. Ibid., 74.
62. Ibid., 261.
63. Ibid., I. 215.
64. M. I. 429.
65. Vn. IV. 6.
66. Ibid., I. 77.
67. cf. Vn. II. 107, 150; IV. 267; see also D. I. 6.
68. For example, the big cities are known for their varied interests in dancing, singing and instrumental musical performances; see D. II. 147; S. V. 369.
69. S. IV. 306.

70. S. V. 168.
71. Suddinna, a son of a *seṭṭhi* and Raṭṭhapāla, a son of a *gahapati*, are addressd by their friends as *samma*.
72. Aḍḍhakāsi, a courtesan, wishes to become a nun and could not be so because others prevented her, not the *saṃgha*. See V. II. 276.
73. Vn. II. 136.
74. Ibid., I. 268-69.
75. D. II. 96-97.
76. For instance, see Vn. III. 15.
77. Vn. I. 268-69.
78. Ibid., III. 178.

79. Ibid., 237.

80. Ibid., 107.
81. M. II. 465 (Nālanda Edition).
82. D. I. 59.
83. A. III. 76.
84. Vn. II. 83.
85. Ibid., IV. 223-24.
86. Ibid., I. 240.
87. Ibid., IV. 131.
88. Ibid., III. 52.
89. Ibid., I. 179.

90. Ibid.
91. Ibid., 88; IV. 120.
92. Ibid., 88.
93. Ibid., 93.
94. S. IV. 341-42; the *bhaṭas* mentioned here are not working for any king but for the ruling extended kin-group known as Koḷiyas. The *bhaṭas* are distinguished by their long hair (*Koḷiyānaṃ lambacūḷake bhaṭe*).
95. Vn. IV. 265.
96. M. I. 85.
97. Ibid., II. 232.
98. A. II. 81-82.
99. M. II. 197-99.

100. Vn. IV. 6.
101. A. III. 208.
102. Ibid., IV. 285; see A. III. 225 f., where the brāhmaṇas follow this occupations.
103. Ibid., IV. 281.
104. See page 183 of this book.
105. A. II. 368.
106. Ibid., IV. 127.
107. *Pāli English Dictionary, sammuda, s.v.*
108. See pages 33, 34 of this book.
109. Vn. I. 272 ff.

110. Ibid., II. 154 ff.
111. Ibid., IV. 162.

112. Ibid., I.4.
113. D. II. 72-168; see Jenning, *Vedantic Buddhism of the Buddha*, 157, where he records the Buddha's journey. The economic importance of these routes has been more or less overlooked.
114. D.II. 344.
115. Vn. III. 200.
116. Ibid., IV. 63.
117. Ibid., I. 151.
118. Ibid., IV. 132-33.
119. D.II. 128.

120. Vn. I. 224.
121. Ibid., III. 6.
122. M. II. 111; A. I. 247-48.
123. S. I. 106.
124. Vn. II. 267.
125. Ibid., IV. 243.
126. A. I. 116-17.
127. Vn. IV. 248.
128. A. III. 383.
129. Ibid., 301-2.

130. Vn. III. 105.
131. Vn. II. 179-80; compare D. III. 93, where the definition of *khattiya* is "Lord of the field", *khettānaṃ patīti kho khattiyo.*
132. D. II. 166.
133. A. IV. 281.
134. S. I. 172.
135. A. I. 241-42.
136. Vn. I. 240, *eken naṅgalena kasantassa satta sītāyo gacchanti.*
137. D. II. 131, *dve kassakā bhātaro hatā cattāro ca balivaddhā.*
138. S. I. 170-71.
139. Vn. IV. 6.

140. M. I. 85; Vin. IV. 6.
141. M. II. 197-99.
142. Ibid., 464 (Nālandā Edition).
143. Ibid., 185-86; *Sutta Nipāta*, 24-25 verses.

144. *Book of the Discipline*, II. p, 47.
145. D.I. 209.
146. Ibid., 208
147. Ibid., 111; M. II. 164.
148. M. II. 71-72.
149. Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index , gṛhapati*, s.v.

150. A. V. 44-45.
151. M. II. 359.
152. D.I. 61.
153. Vn. III. 222; I. B. Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, II. 67.
154. S. IV. 109-24; A. IV. 209-35, for Brāhmaṇa Gahapatis see pages 19, 20, 73,74 and 75 of this book.
155. Vn. I. 240-44.
156. Ibid., II. 158.
157. Ibid., 154.
158. Ibid., 157.
159. Ibid., I. 172.

160. Ibid., 276.
161. Ibid., I. 274.
162. S. I. 89 ff.
163. M. III. 175-76.
164. A. V. 342-43.
165. Ibid., 117.
166. M. II. 185.
167. S. II. 112-13.
168. A. V. 40.
169. Ibid., III. 363.

170. *Pāli English Dictionary, bhoga*, s.v.
171. Ibid.
172. A. IV. 6-7.
173. Ibid., III. 129.
174. Ibid., II. 157.
175. Ibid., III. 222.
176. S. I. 44.
177. A. V. 135.
178. Ibid., 136.
179. S. IV. 238.
180. Ibid., 246.

181. A. II. 66-67.
182. Ibid., 69.
183. Ibid., V. 177.
184. Ibid., III. 45-46.
185. Ibid., II. 68-69.
186 S. I. 90-91.
187. D. III. 188.
188. A. IV. 282-83.
189. Ibid., 283-84.

190. Ibid., I. 129-30.
191. Ibid., V. 176-82.
192. Ibid., 43
193. M. I. 365-66.
194. D.III. 180, 181.
195. A. V. 84.
196. Ibid., I. 250-51.
197. Ibid., III. 129.
198. Vn. III. 73.
199. S. III. 351.

200. Vn. III. 73.
201. M. I. 450-52.
202. A. V. 84.
203. Ibid., III. 109.
204. S. IV. 190.
205. D.D. Kosambi, *Introdution to Indian History*, 168.
206. S. I. 89-90.
207. Ibid., 92.
208. A. III. 32-33.

Notes to the Conclusion

1. *Ñāti* in Pāli is used sometines as nominative singular and at other time as plural. We may compare the modern term for subcaste, such as *ātmiya* (Bengali), *bhaibandh* (Hindi) and *jñāti* (Marathi), which are used in sinngular. For the term *ñāti* in Asokan edicts, see R. E. 3; L. 3, 4 (Junagad); L. 4, 3 (Shahabazgarhi); L. 6. 13; L. 4, 5 (Girnar); L. 8. 11 (Kalsi); Ls. 87,38,5, L.16. etc. The contents of these, and many others, show a remarkable affinity to those of the

Pāli passages cited above pages 111-24 of this book (references to the inscriptions are from Ed. Hultzsch).

Bibliography

Pāli Texts

Aṅguttara Nikāya — Ed. R. Morris and E. Hardy, 5 volumes, London: Pali Text Society, 1885-1910.

Tr. F.L. Woodward and E.M. Hare, *The Book of the Gradual Sayings*, 5 volumes, London: Pali Text Society, 1932-1936.

Buddhaghosa — *Dhammapada Aṭṭhakathā*, ed. H. Smith and H.C. Norman, 5 volumes, London: Pali Text Society, 1906-15.

Tr. E.W. Burlinghame, *Buddhist Legends*, 3 volumes, Harvard Oriental Series, vols. xxviii-xxx, Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard.

Papañca Sūdanī (Commentary to *Majjhima Nikāya*), ed. J.H. Woods, D. Kosambi and I.B. Horner, 5 volumes, London: Pali Text Society, 1922-38.

Paramattha Jotikā (Commentary to *Sutta Nipāta*), ed. H. Smith, 3 volumes, London: Pali Text Society, 1916-18.

Samanata Pāsādikā (Commentary to *Vinaya Piṭaka*), ed. J. Takakasu and M. Nagai, 7 volumes, London: Pali Text Society, 1924-47.

Sumangala Vilāsinī (Commentary to *Dīgha Nikāya*), ed. T.W. Rhys Davids, J. Estlin Carpenter, and W. Stede, 3 volumes, London: Pali Text Society, 1886-1932.

Dhammapada	*The Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon*, Part I, Sacred Books of the Buddhists, vol. 7, *Dhammapada, etc.*, ed. and tr. Mrs. Rhys Davids. London: Oxford University Press, 1931.
Dīgha Nikāya	Ed. T.W. Rhys Davids and J. Estlin Carpenter, 3 volumes, London: Pali Text Society, 1890-1911.
	Tr. T.W. Rhys Davids and Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, 3 volumes, Sacred Books of the Buddhists, London: Oxford University Press, 1899.
Jātaka	Ed. V. Fausböll, 6 volumes and Index, London: Oxford University Press, 1877-97.
	Tr. various hands, ed. E.B. Cowell, 6 volumes and Index, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895-1907.
Majjhima Nikāya	Ed. V. Treckner and Lord Chalmers, 3 volumes, London: Pali Text Society, 1888-1899, Ed. P.V. Bapat, R. Sankritayana and Bhikkhu Kashyap, 3 volumes, Nālandā: Nālanda Devanāgarī Pāli Series, 1958.
Majjhima Nikāya	Tr. I.B. Horner, *The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings*, 3 volumes, London: Pali Text Society, 1954-59.
Petavatthu	Ed. Minayett, London: Pali Text Society, 1988.
	Tr. H.S. Gehman, London: Pali Text Society, 1942.

Saṃyutta Nikāya Ed. L. Feer, 6 volumes, London: Pali Text Society, 1884-1904.

Tr. C.A.F. Rhys Davids and F.L. Woodward, *The Book of Kindred Sayings*, 5 volumes, London: Pali Text Society, 1917-30.

Sutta Nipāta Ed. V. Fausböll, 2 volumes, London: Pali Text Society, 1885-94.

Tr. V. Fausböll, Sacred Book of the East, vol 10 (second edition, revised), London: Oxford University Press, 1924.

Vinaya Piṭaka Ed. H. Oldenberg, 5 volumes, London: Oxford University Press, 1879-83.

Tr. I. B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, 5 parts, Sacred Books of the East, London: Oxford University Press, 1938-52.

Other Sources

Adikaram, E.W. *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1953.

Barua, B.M. *Asoka and His Inscriptions*, 2 volumes, Calcutta: New Age Publishers, 1946.

Bechert, H. "The Date of the Buddha Reconsidered," *Indologica Turinensia*, 2, (1978), 29-36.

Bühler, G. *The Laws of Manu*, Sacred Books of the East, vol. 25, Oxford: The Clarenden Press, 1886.

Chakravarty, U. *Social Origins of Buddhism*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Erdosy, George. "Archaeology of Early Buddhism," *Essays on Buddhism in Honour of Professor A. K. Warder*, ed. N. K. Wagle and F. Watanabe,. Centre for South Asian Studies Papers, no. 5. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1993, 40-56.

Urbanisation in Early Historic India, Oxford: BAR Series, 1990.

Fick, Richard. *The Social Organization in North East India in Buddha's Time*, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1920.

Fiser, Ivor. "The Problem of the Seṭṭhi in Buddhist Jātakas," *Archiv Orientalani*, 1954, 238-65.

Firth, R. W. *Elements of Social Organization*, London: Watts, 1951.

Frank, Otto. "The Buddhist Councils at Rājagaha and Vesāli as Alleged in Cullavagga XI, XII," *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 1908, 1-80.

Ghosh, A. *Indian Archeolgy A Review*, Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India, 1953-61.

Herskevits, M.J. *Man and His Works: the Science of Cultural Anthropolgy*, New York: Knoff, 1948.

Hultzsch, E. *Inscriptions of Asoka*, Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. I, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1925.

Jacobi, H. *Jaina Sūtras*, The Sacred Books of the East vol. 22, Oxford: Clarenden Press, 1884.

Jain, J.C. *Life in Ancient India as Depicted in the Jain Canons*, Bombay: New Book Co., 1947.

Jaywickrame, N.A. *Analysis of Sutta Nipāta*, Unpublished London University Ph.D Thesis, 1947.

Jennings, J.E. *Vedantic Buddhism of the Buddha*, London: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Kane, P.V. *History of Dharamaśastra*, 5 volumes, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1930-1962.

Kosambi, D.D. *An Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, Bombay: Popular Book Depot, 1956.

"Early Stages of the Caste System in Northern India", *Journal of Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1946, 32-48.

Kroeber, Alfred L. *Anthropology: Culture Patterns and Processes*, London, 1948.

Lamotte, Etienne. *Historie due Bouddhisme Indien*, Louvain Publications, Louvain: Universiataires, 1958.

"Problems Concernant lex Texts Canoniques Mineurs," *Journal Asiatique*, 1956, 249-63.

Law, B.C. *Kshatriya Clans in Buddhist India*, Calcutta: Thacker Spink, 1922.

Geography of Early Buddhism, London: Kegan Paul, 1932.

A History of Pali Literature, 2 volumes, London: Trench, Trubner, 1933.

India as Described in Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism, Delhi: Bharatiya, 1980 (Reprint 1941 ed.).

Tribes in Ancient India, Poona: Oriental Book Depot, 1943.

Macdonell, A.A. and A.B. Keith. *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, 2volumes, London: John Murray, 1912.

Malalasekera, G.P. *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, 2 volumes, London: John Murray, 1937-38.

Marshall, J.H. "Rājagaha and its Remains," *Archaeological Survey of India*, Calcutta, 1905-6, 86-106.

Mehta, R.N. *Pre-Buddhist India*, Bombay: Examiner Press, 1939.

Murdock, J.P. "British Social Anthropology," *American Anthropologist*, vol.53, 465-73.

Nadel, S.F. *The Foundation of Social Anthropology*, London: Cohen and West, 1953.

Pande, G.C. *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism*, Allahabad: Law Press, 1957.

Przyluski, Jean. *Le Councile de Rājagṛha*, Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1926-8.

Ram Gopal. *India of Vedic Kalpasūtras*, Delhi: National Publishing House, 1959.

Rapson, E.J. *The Cambridge History of India*, vol. I, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922.

Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. and D.Forde. — *African Systems of Kinship and Marriage*, London: Oxford University Press (Paperback edition), 1960.

Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. — *Structure and Function in Primitive Society*, London: Cohen and West, 1956.

Raychaudhari, H.C. — *Political History of Ancient India*, 6th edition, Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1956.

Redfield, R. — *The Little Community: Peasant Society and Culture*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Rhys Davids, C.A. — "Notes on Early Economic Condition in Northern India," *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*, 1901, 859-94.

Pasalms of the Early Buddhists (*Pasalms of the Brethren*, vol. II), London: Pali Text Society, 1909-13.

Rhys Davids, T.W. — *Buddhist India*, New York: G. P. Putnam and Sons, 1903.

Sharma, G.S. — *The Excavations at Kauśambi*, (1957-59), Allahabad: University of Allahbad, 1960.

Sharma J.P. — *Republics in Ancient India*, Leiden: J. Brill, 1968.

Sharma, R.S. — *Material Culture and Social Formations, in Ancient India*, Delhi: Macmillan, 1983.

Sūdras in Ancient India, Delhi: Motilala Banarasidass, 1958.

Spooner, D.B. "Mr. Ratan Tata's Excavation at Pāṭaliputra", *Archaeological Survey of India*, 1912-1913, 53-86.

Thapar, Romila. *Ancient Indian Social History*, Delhi: Macmillan, 1978.

From Lineage to State, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Vogel, J. "Excavations at Saheth Maheth," *Archaeolgocial Survey of India*, 1907-8 (1911), 81-131.

Warder, A.K. *Pali Metre*, London: Pali Text Society, 1967.

Indian Buddhism, Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass, 1970.

Winternitz, M. *A History of Indian Literature*, vol. I, tr. from German by Mrs. S. Ketkar, Calcutta University of Calcutta, 1927-33.

Index

Abhaya, 52
Acela Kassapa, 53,67,77
Adikaram, E. W.,87
Aggika Jaṭila, 13,15
Ajātasattu,39,40,44,79,80,
111,114,123,158,
159,171,174,177
Ajjuka, 115,123
Āḷavi, 23
Ambagāma, 181
Ambalaṭṭhikā, 181
Ambapālī,29,30,176
Ambaṭṭha, 20,50,133,143,
152,153,156
Ambugāma, 45
Ānanda, 22,25-28,38,60-62,
64,66,69,74,93,115,
123,139,144,160,188
Anāthapiṇḍika, 20,30,56,68,69,84,93
104,122,126,128,138,
143,150,181,187,190,
Andhakavinda, 182
Aṅgaka, 123,153
Aṅga, 37-40,42
Aṅgulimāla, 14,24,59,73,155
Anurādha, 62
Anuruddha, 27,60,64,65,100,
101,104
Ariṭṭha, 62
Asibandhakaputta, 168
Artisans, 171-73
Asoka, 1
Assaka, 37
Assalāyana, 35,132
Assapura, 39
Avanti,33,34,37,40

Baka Brahmā, 89
Bechert, Heinz, 5
Belaṭṭha Kaccāna, 182
Banaras, 24,29,41,55,181
Bhabra, Edict of Asoka, 1
Bhaddiya, 117
Bhaggas of Suṃsimāra,45
Bhallika, 146,148
Bhaṇḍagāma, 45,181
Bhāradvāja, 83,184
Bhesikā, 71
Bhoga, Money, 189-97
Bhoganagara, 45,181
Bhūmija, 62,64
Bimbisāra of Magadha, 16,19,23,
26,38, 41,
64,68,80,93,104,112,
114,139,178,185
Bodhi, Prince, 70
Bodhisatta, 103,137
Bose, A. N.,3
*Brahmā & Brāhmaṇas,*94,95,96
Brahmā Gods, 87,88,89,94-97,
100-103,105,106

Brahmadatta of Kasi, 147
Brahmadeyya, 19
Brahmaloka, Brahmāworld, 95-98,100,102,103,104,106,
Brāhmaṇa Gāmas, 18,20
Brāhmaṇā & Brahmaṇa, 69
*Brāhmaṇas & Kings,*70
Brāhmaṇa ,Prince, Barber, 70,71
*Brāhmaṇas & Paribbājakas,*71
Brahmāyu, 50,51,69
Brother & Brother, 116,117
*Brother & Sister,*118
Buddha & Brahmaṇās, 49-52
Buddha & Brahmāworld, 87-89
Buddha & Gahapatis, 56,57
Buddha & Gāmaṇīs, 57,58
*Buddha & Gods,*83-87
Buddha & Jains, 52
Buddha & Kings, 57
Buddha & Monks, 54-56
*Buddha & Others,*59
Buddha & Paribbājakas, 52-54
Buddha & Upāsakas, 59
Buddhaghosa, 135,162,163
Buddha Kassapa, 171
Bullis of Allakappa, 45
Campā, 19,25,28
Caṅki, 19
Caste, 165
Cātummārāja Gods, 94,96-99,102,103,104
Ceti, 37Channa, 61,140
*Charity,*84,92,93,102
Citta ,65,6769,77,94,139,147
Cullavagga, 2
Dabba Mallaputta, 55
Daṇḍapāṇi,58
Dasama, 188
Devadaha, 33,42
Devadatta,62,88,
Dhana, Money, 189
Dhānañjāni, 95,136
Dhaniya, 15,26,171,172,185
Dīghajānu Koḷiya Putta, 143
Dīghanakha, 52
Dīgha Tapassi,78
Dīghāvu Upāsaka, 59,69,147
Dīghiti of Kosala, 147,170,172
Doṇa, 71
Edicts-Bhabra, 1
Ekanāla, Village, 20
Ekusāri, 151
Entertainers, 175,176
Erdosy, George,5
Father, Mother & Daughter, 115,116
Fick, Richard, 3
Gahapatis, 51,56,64,67,68,69,72,75,78,81,183,186
*Gahapatis & Brahmāṇas,*68
Gahapatis & Gahapatis, 69
Gahapatis & Gāmaṇis, 68

Gahapatis & Jains, 67
Gahapatis & Kings, 68
*Gahapatis & Others,*68,69
*Gahapatis & Paribbājakas,*67
Gāma, 13-23
Gāma & Kin-groups, 16,17,18
Gāma & Nigama, 20-23
Gāmaṇis,57,58,68,72
Gandhāra,37
Gangā, River,26,180
Ghosita, 186
Ghositārāma, 5
Ghoṭamukha, 63
Giribajja,25
Gods & Gods, 96-100
Gods & People, 92,93,94
Gonisādinivitṭho gāma, 14
Gopaka Moggāllana, 15,185
Gotama, 49-56,68
*Gotta,*155,156,157

Hatthaka,86,87,186
Hatthigāma, 45,181
Horner, I. B.,14,185
Household Group,136-141
Husband & Wife, 118-123
Husband's Parents &Son's wife, 123-126

Icchānaṅkala, 19
*Inter-Group Organization,*150-153
Isidatta,117
Isigili, mountain, 13

Jantu, Devaputta, 90
Jānussoṇi,102

Kaccāna,142,150
Kajaṅgala, 33
Kālāmas, 37,45
Kalandaka,17
Kalpa Sūtra,42
Kamboja,35,37
Kammāsadamma, 22
Kānā,115
Kandaraka, 54
Kaṇhāyana, 133
Kapilavatthu,28,29,41,42,160
Kāsi,37,170,172
Kassapa Sīhanāda Sutta, 53
Keṇiya Jaṭila,22,139,146
Khaṇḍakas, 2
Khānumata, 15, 16
Khomadussa, 18,19
Kin-groups, extended, 36-38
King's Service, 176-179
Kinship grouping, 136
Kisa Saṅkicca, 154
Kokanuda,62,66
Kokālika, 88
Koḷiyas, 37
Koḷiyas of Rāmagāma, 45
Kosala,6,19,37,40-42,182
Kosala & Sākyas, 41,42
Kosambi,5,17,25,27,28,181
Kosambi, D.D.,42
Koṭigāma,45,181
Kuḍḍanagaraka, 25

Kuru , 37
Kusinārā, 25,26,28,43,60,181
Kūṭadanta, 19,69,155
Kūṭi, 13

Law, B. C., 44,46
Licchavis, 37,42,43,44,45,49,58
Licchavi-origin of, 135
Lohicca, 19,71,142,150,170,186

Magadha, 6,18,19,38,39,40
Māgandiya, 71
Mahābrahmā, 96,97,105
Mahākaccāna, 33,60,65
Mahāgovinda,80,95,97,119,121, 145,161
Mahājanapadas,38
Mahākassapa, 60
Mahāmoggallana, 55
Mahānāma, 45,184,186
Mahāparinibbana Sutta, 25,61
Mahāpajāpati,117
Mahāsāla, 34
Mahāsāla, brāhamaṇa,132
Mahāvijita, 26
Majjhima Aṭṭhkathā, 108
Makhadeva, 93,170
Makkarakaṭa, 142,150
Makkhali Gosāla,154
Makuṭabandhana,28
Mallas, 23,27,28,37,42,43,45, 58,71,73,1339,144,159,184
Mallika, Queen,120,159
Manasākaṭa, 19
Mānatthaddha, 112,116
Maṇicūḷaka,66
Manu, 42,43

Marriage, 127-135
Marriage, brahmin practice of, 131-134
Māyā, 117
Meḍaḷumpa, 42
Meghiya,143
Mehta, R.,3
Meṇḍaka, 67,125,184,186,187
Mettiya, 62
Moggallāna, 61,63,65
Money, 189-197
Monks & Brāhmaṇas, 63
Monks & Gahapatis, 64,65
Monks & Gods, 89,92
Monks & Kings, 64
Monks & Monks, 60,61,62
Monks & Others, 66,67
*Monks & Paribbājjakas,*62,63
Monks & Ruling Extended kin group, 52
*Monks & Upāsakas,*66
Moriyas of Pipphalivana, 45
Mother's Brother & Sister's son, 123,124
Muṇḍā, 64,119,120

Nadel, S. F., 9,10
Nādikā, 181
Nakulapitā,119,186
Nagaravinda, 19
*Nagara &Mahānagara,*28,31

Nālanda,36,181
Nandaka, 66
Nanda, 92, 113,117
Nanda Vaccha, 154
Naṅgaraka, 42
Nāgita, 63
Ñātakas, 147,148,149
Ñāti, 159-63
Ñātika, 45
Ñātisālohita, 146,147
Negama, 23
Nigamas, 20-23
Niganṭha Nātaputta, 52,67,77,78
Nigrodha, 76

Okkāka, 134
Opasāda, village, 18,19
Otto, Franke, 61

Paccanīka Brāhmaṇa, 49
Pajjota of Avanti, 40,181
Pañcāla,37ge, 15, 16
Pande, G. C., 2
Paribbājakas, 52,53,54,62, 63,67,71,72
Parents & Sons, 111-115
Parivāra, 2
Pasenadi, of Kosala, 19,40,41,70,84,114, 116,120,123,126,139,158
Pāṭaligāma, 26
Pāṭaliputta,26
Pātimokkha, 2
Pāvā, 43
Pāyāsi, 92
Pessa,54
Peta Vatthu, 25
Pilindavaccha, 16
Pilotika, 71
Piṇḍola Bhāradvāja, 56
Pingiyāni, 49
Pokkharasādi, 19,69,139,152
Poṭaliputta,62
Poṭaliya,56,115,185
Prayāga,36
Professions, 173,174,175
Pubbārāma, 40
Pukkusāti,55
Pura & Nagara, 23-28
Puraṇa, 117
Pūraṇa Kassapa, 154

Radcliffe-Brown, 7,8,108-110
Rāhula, 112,113,114
Rajagaha, 15,16,23,25-28,30,39, 121,150,171,181,182
Raṭṭhapāla,113,116,118,119,120
Reṇu,80
Rohitassa Devaputta, 84,85
Rhys Davids,2,3,25,37,82,98

Saccaka, 52,78
Sahampati, Brahmā, 87,88,91,95,102
Sāketa,28,29,40,178,187
Sakka, God,86,88,91,98,99, 100,102,104
Sākyas,22,41,37,58,117,133,134, 141,152,156,159,161

Sālavaṭikā, 19
Samiddhi, 62,84,90
Sandhāna, 76
Sañjaya,70
Sañjikāputta, 71,132
Setakaṇṇika,34
*Seṭṭhi gahapati,*23,29,30,69,187
Sigālovāda Sutta, 121
Sīlāvati, 23,30,176
Sirivaddha, 69
Sister & Sister, 117
Soṇa, 178,185,186
Soṇadaṇḍa,19,50,69,123,155,160,185
Soṇa Koḷivisa, 29,112
Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa, 66
Subha Toḍeyyaputta,68
Sudassana, 70
Sudatta, 57
Suddhamma, 65,78
Suddhodana Sākya, 113,117
Sudinna, 17,30,69,113,114,
118,119,120,125,161
Sujātā,118,122,126
Sundarika, 153,155
Sunīdha, 26
Surasena, 37
Suppīyā,119

Taittiriīya Āraṇyaka, 24
Takkasīlā,181
Tapoda Park, 67
Tapussa, 146,181
Tārukkha, 19
Tāvatiṃsa, Heaven, 91,93,98,104,106
Tekula,117
Thapar, Romila, 5
Thullakoṭṭhika,22
Thullananda, 283
Thūṇa, 27
Toḍeyya, 1
Trading & Commercial Activities,
179,180-83
Tusita, Heaven, 69, 76

Udayana, 5
Udāyi, 66,116,125,127,
129,141,148
Udena, king,40
Ujjaya, 180
Ujjaini, 181
Ukkalā, 181
Ukkaṭṭhā, 19
Upāli, 69,115,123,174
Upananda, 56,143,148
Upāsakas, 59,66,72
Upasena Vaṅgataputta, 55
Uruvela,22
Usīraddhaja,34
Uttara,69,99

Vacchagotta, 53,63
Vaddha, 139,147
Vakkhali,85
Vajji,37,43,44,45,134
Vaṇṇa, 157,158,159
Vepacitti,100
Vāseṭṭha, 58,146
Vassakāra,26,36,79

Vaṭṭagāmanī, 1
Vegaḷinga, 21,22
Vekhanassa, 53
Venāgapura, 20
Veracchānī, 63
Verañja, 182
Vesāli, 1,17,28,29,44,
115,135,181
Vessavana, 94,95
Vijaya, 143
Vijayamāhita, 67
Visākha Pāñcālaputta,55
Vrātya kṣatriyas, 42

Warder, A. K., 2
Winternitz, Maurice, 3

Yamaka, 61
Yasa,112,113,116
Yamelu,117
Yona Kamboja,35,132

Professor Narendra K. Wagle is Director of the Centre for South Asian Studies in the University of Toronto, Canada. He was a post-doctoral fellow in the University of Chicago, and was teaching at the University of Virginia and Skidmore College, before joining the University of Toronto in 1966. His current projects include eighteenth century social and legal history of western India.

(3366)

Cover by Meena R.Shinde

New Light on Early Buddhism

B.G.Gokhale

Gautama, the Buddha, in his earthly career of some eigthy-five years initiated a movement that profoundly affected the intellectual, religious and cultural history of Indians over a millennium. Though it disappeared from the land of its birth, it continues to be the conscience of large parts of Asia to the present day. Most of the work on Buddhism, and their number run into the hundreds, largely treat it either as a system of philosophy or religion, or the inspiration behind countless works of art scattered across the Asian continent. The fourteen essays included in this volume explore some hitherto neglected dimensions of the Buddhist revolution in the realms of social, economic and political thought.The essays cover topics ranging from ideas on society, economy, political organization to aesthetics and religious mores. The last essay describes the state of Buddhism in its final phases during the Gupta age. The work is based on material from the Buddhist Canonical and Post-Canonical literature and is a distinct contribution toward a new understanding of the place of some specifically Buddhist ideas in the cultural history of India.

New Frontiers of Archaeology

Heras Memorial Lectures

S.R.Rao

Archaeology as a discipline has made enormous strides in recent years. The Indus Valley Civilization has kindled the imagination of the world since the discovery of Mohenjo-daro and Harappa. In this book, using archaeology as a tool to reconstruct history, the author reaffirms the scientific and technological advancement and urbanisation of the Harappa Civilization. With a scientific approach to the problem of decoding the script, giving detailed description and interpretations of the writings on the innumerable seals and sealings with illustrations, Dr. S.R.Rao, the well-known archaeologist, tries to show that the Indus script was a phonetic script with close affinity to Vedic Sanskrit and other Indo-European languages. The religious symbols discovered in the excavations show that the Indus faith, with its emphasis on fire worship, was a link between the Vedic and Avestan faiths. Against previous conjectures the author concludes that the inhabitants of the Indus Valley civilization were Aryan.

The recent excavations in the seabed near Dwaraka (Gujarat) bear evidence that the ancient city of Dvaraka founded by and dedicated to Krishna did exist Analysis of the finds corroborate many facts mentioned in the Mahabharata. The author describes some interesting scientific advancement in the science of archaeology in general and marine archaeology in particular.